Plots of Opportunity

Plots of Opportunity

Representing Conspiracy in Victorian England

Albert D. Pionke

The Ohio State University Press
Columbus

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Pionke, Albert D., 1974–
Plots of opportunity : representing conspiracy in Victorian England / Albert D. Pionke.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-8142-0948-3 (alk. paper) — ISBN 0-8142-9037-X (cd-rom)
1. English fiction—19th century—History and criticism. 2. Conspiracies in literature. 3. English prose literature—19th century—History and criticism. 4. Conspiracies—Great Britain—History—19th century—Historiography. 5. Great Britain—History—Victoria, 1837–1901—Historiography. I. Title.
PR878.C65P56 2004
823'.809358—dc22
2003027688

Cover design by Dan O'Dair.
Type set in Perpetua.
Printed by Thomson-Shore, Inc.

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials. ANSI Z39.48–1992.

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

Acknowledgments

In the course of writing this book I have been fortunate enough to receive intellectual support and productive disagreement from many sources. This project began as a dissertation at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. I would like to thank the department of English for its unstinting encouragement and crucial financial support in my final year of writing. I would also like to thank the members of my original doctoral committee—Amanda Anderson, Peter Garrett, Janet Lyon, and Julia Saville—for their unstinting sympathy and demanding criticism. David Hirsch and Jack Stillinger also offered valuable hints about relevant texts during my original writing process.

Librarians at a number of institutions greatly expedited both my original and subsequent research. I would like to thank the staff of the University of Illinois, Washington University in Saint Louis, George Washington University, and University of Cincinnati libraries.

A condensed version of the second chapter has appeared in the *Victorian Newsletter* 97 (Spring 2000): 1–14, and a version of chapter 4 has been published in the *Victorians Institute Journal* 28 (2000): 109–40. I am grateful to their editors and publishers for allowing me to use this material here. The perceptive readers and editor of *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* also provided a helpful critique of an earlier draft of chapter 5.

I would also like to thank the editorial staff at The Ohio State University Press for all their hard work. My two anonymous readers offered penetrating criticism and practical suggestions for how to improve the manuscript. Heather Lee Miller has also been unswervingly patient, persistent and highly professional; everyone should be lucky enough to have such a wonderful editor.

Finally, I want to thank Ruth Pionke, whose scientific skepticism during repeated readings of every word has forced me to discipline a sometimes unruly argument. I dedicate this book to her and to my parents, who, while they might not have always understood what I was up to, nevertheless remained my ardent supporters.

Introduction

In the autobiographical introduction to "Secret Societies" (1847), idiosyncratic English author Thomas De Quincey admits that a precocious fascination has prompted his essay on this "highest form of the incredible" (178). He remembers that between the impressionable ages of seven and ten, he engaged in numerous debates with "a stern lady" over Abbé Barruel's *Memoirs, Illustrating the History of Jacobinism* and John Robison's *Proofs of a Conspiracy Against all the Religions and Governments of Europe, carried on in the secret meetings of the Free Masons, Illuminati and Reading Societies.* Both texts appeared in English in 1797, amid the threat of French invasion and the looming presence of the French Revolution, and, from a Catholic and a Protestant position, respectively, they attack Freemasonry and Illuminism as the secret authors of European unrest. The Abbé's "awful shape of four volumes octavo" established a particularly powerful hold over the young De Quincey (175), who recognized a certain sympathetic attractiveness in Barruel's conspiratorial villains, even as he remained somewhat perplexed by their fantastical role in recent history:

> This plot, by the Abbé's account, stretched its horrid fangs, and threw out its forerunning feelers and *tentacles,* into many nations, and more than one century. *That* perplexed me, though also fascinated me by its grandeur. How men, living in distant periods and distant places—men that did not know each other, nay, often had not even heard of each other, nor spoke the same languages—could yet be parties to the same treason against a mighty religion towering to the highest heavens, puzzled my understanding. Then, also, when wickedness was so easy, *why* did people take all this trouble to be wicked? The *how* and the *why* were alike incomprehensible to me. (174)

Rather than feeling repugnance as a result of Barruel's cephalopodic figuration of the societies' wickedness, De Quincey instead found himself "fascinated" by their international commitment to resist "a mighty religion" for over a century. In fact, the societies' very "wickedness" in the *Memoirs* invested them with a "grandeur" they never would have had on their own, while the incomprehensibility of the "how" and

the "why" of this wickedness "did but sharpen the interest of wonder that gathered about the general economy of Secret Societies" (177–78), thereby making De Quincey increasingly vehement in his debates. These often ended with a "violent exertion of authority" by his adult opponent, who was forced to assert that while logic might find flaws in Barruel's argument, "experience" showed it to be essentially unassailable (176). Such conclusions were deeply dissatisfying to the young De Quincey, who desperately wanted to be proven wrong so that his logic and his secret belief in Barruel could be reconciled.

Elsewhere in the introduction, De Quincey acknowledges that his childhood engrossment with secret societies was unusual. However, he maintains that a similar interest is only natural among thoughtful adults:

> Generally speaking, a child may *not*—but every adult *will* and *must,* if at all by nature meditative—regard with a feeling higher than vulgar curiosity small fraternities of men forming themselves as separate and inner vortices within the great vortex of society; communicating silently in broad daylight by signals not even seen, or, *if* seen, not understood except among themselves; and connected by the link either of purposes not safe to be avowed, or by the grander link of awful truths which, merely to shelter themselves from the hostility of an age unprepared for their reception, are forced to retire, possibly for generations, behind thick curtains of secrecy. To be hidden amidst crowds is sublime; to come down hidden amongst crowds from distant generations is doubly sublime. (173)

This passage builds upon the sense of secret societies' historical continuity expressed above even as it more precisely accounts for the "why" of their prolonged secretive behavior. For De Quincey, secret societies serve as repositories of purposes and truths too advanced for the culture at large. In a tacit challenge to the prevailing middle-class standard of Victorian manliness as transparent and open, he approves and even celebrates the secrecy practiced by these "small fraternities of men."[1] In fact, their clandestine community of truth is described as "doubly sublime," a label that grants them both spiritual and aesthetic status. "Secret Societies" thus invites its readers to practice the same kind of secrecy as its subject by appealing to a set of imperceptible standards of value accessible only to the "meditative" and too advanced for the middle-class "great vortex of society." In other words, De Quincey attempts to overcome the presumed hostility to secret societies sparked by Barruel's accusation of "treason" by abandoning the Abbé's external political register in favor of his own discourse of interiority.

"Secret Societies" neatly captures the complex dialectic between exterior political condemnation and interior subjective attraction at the heart of Victorian

England's multivalent rhetoric of secrecy. *Plots of Opportunity* offers an extended reexamination of this dialectic that seeks to clarify the unanswered questions of "how" and "why" from De Quincey's original investigation of secret societies. Instead of accepting the ahistorical sublimity of these "small fraternities" or attempting to uncover their "purposes" and "awful truths," however, this book strives to situate De Quincey's "general economy of Secret Societies" within the specific confines of just over forty years of English culture, from 1829 to 1870. Although this period from Catholic emancipation to Italian unification contains many factual secret societies—the Freemasons, the Thugs, the Carbonari, the Fenians, etc.—it is the productive function of the secret society as a rhetorical figure that serves as my main object of analysis. Concentrating on the functions rather than the forms of secret societies at once obviates the tendency towards ferreting out *the* secret of a specific society and locates secret societies in general within the recently burgeoning critical discourse on nineteenth-century secrecy. Once within this discursive field, the secret society as a fact becomes less significant than the secret society as a figure that generates its own "facts" according to the particular historical agents involved.[2]

These agents occupy a broad spectrum of class, religion, race, and nationality, ranging from aristocrats to trade unionists, Establishment clergy to Roman Catholics, British bureaucrats to Indian rebels, and Irish nationalists to Italian brigands. Their party affiliations and political positions similarly run the gamut from ultra-Tory to Liberal to radically Radical, from constitutional monarchist to red republican. Even these agents' ideological investment in accusations of conspiracy ranges widely from an apparently genuine belief in the presence and danger of secret plots to more opportunistic denunciations for the purposes of propaganda. They are held together, however, by their common connection to a rhetoric of secrecy centered on the figure of the secret society and by their collective contribution to Victorian democratic debate through this connection. The central project of this book is to trace this rhetorical intersection of secrecy and democracy during several crucial moments of debate over the character of England's emerging democracy. I approach these moments of democratic crisis by focusing, first, on the explicitly political reaction in Parliament, the periodical press and elsewhere to attempts by an underenfranchised constituency to gain more equitable representation; and, second, on a network of more literary texts that absorb this initial political rhetoric and use it to construct a field of aesthetic possibilities that offers potential insights into and consequences for the original crisis. Due to the increasingly close connection between Britain's domestic and imperial policies during the period under consideration, my investigation interrogates the productive functions of the figure of the secret society both at home, where it was often initially deployed in an effort to stop "the lower orders" from securing social and political equality, and abroad, where it served as a

useful tool for preserving the "natural" inferiority of the "non-English races." In both cases, the figure of the secret society allows De Quincey's dialectic between condemnation and admiration to become especially perspicuous, inflecting the parliamentary, periodical and literary discourses that, together, constitute Victorian England's larger democratic debate.

I

My approach to this debate draws equally from the historicist and formalist branches of contemporary critical theory and, with respect to the most recognizably literary of the texts I address, the Victorians' own expansive conceptions of the novel and novel-writing. Working out of a tradition of Marxist analysis established by Fredric Jameson and Raymond Williams, as well as developments in postcolonial theory following the publication of Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978), I examine texts, both literary and nonliterary, within the material and imperial contexts in which they occur. I do not argue that these contexts can be used to reduce every text to a simple matter of class conflict or colonial exploitation, but rather that they provide a field of historical possibility that the text helps to construct. This field of possibility adds an ideological dimension to my close readings of particular texts' formal strategies of characterization, narration, structure and signification. I share with deconstructive critics the practice of seeking out the internal contradictions of such methods of self-presentation in order to expose the host of inevitably fractured, competing and even contradictory meanings within the text. I then use these intra-textual contradictions as a principle point of entry into the ideological fissures already present in the text's field of historical possibility, paying particular attention to their role in the intersection of a uniquely Victorian rhetoric of secrecy and the ongoing debate over the character of England's emerging democracy through the figure of the secret society.

Victorian theories of the novel allow prose fiction a large role in this debate. For example, Fitzjames Stephens, writing in 1857, asserts that "contemporary novelists" are "the most influential of all indirect moral teachers" (125). Overall, this power of influence disturbs him, especially when it is exercised by writers like Charles Dickens to satirize the upper classes, the government and others in authority through such fictional constructs as the Circumlocution Office. In fact, he spends a great deal of time criticizing *Little Dorrit* for its lack of fidelity to legal and historical precedent, thereby revealing his own equation of novel writing and history. Two years later in "Popular Literature—The Periodical Press," English critic E. S. Dallas extends Stephens's argument, asserting that literature "is now a complete representation of society, from

the crown on its head to the buckle on its shoe, from its highest aspirations to its meanest want . . . a perfect index of the innumerable processes at work throughout the whole frame of society" (96–97). Indeed, for Dallas, literature "is not only the expression of public opinion and the index of contemporary history, it is itself a great force that reacts on the life which it represents, half creating what it professes only to reflect" (97). Paradoxically, Dallas's theory of reciprocal representation at once elevates literary works to an extraordinarily prominent cultural position even as it divests them of the exclusive aura of literariness that sets them apart from texts often seen as the province of history. It is this Victorian sense of disciplinary slippage that I have tried to reflect in my own choice of texts.[3]

My investigation into the crucial role of the figure of the secret society works against the hint of ridiculousness that the subject has elicited following De Quincey's 1847 essay. Certainly among twentieth-century scholars denigration of research into secret societies has a long history. As early as 1937, in his otherwise positive review of Douglas Knoop and G. P. Jones's *An Introduction to Freemasonry,* John Saltmarsh observes that the investigation of secret societies frequently leads one into "a department of history which is not only obscure and highly controversial, but by ill luck the happiest of all hunting grounds for the light-headed, the fanciful, the altogether unscholarly and the lunatic fringe of the British Museum Reading Room" (103).[4] An entire field of what might be more moderately called para-scholarship on secret societies written for a mostly popular audience demonstrates the continued currency of Saltmarsh's observation. Some of the best of this work, like Marie Mulvey Roberts's *British Poets and Secret Societies* and Roberts and Hugh Ormsby-Lennon's *Secret Texts: The Literature of Secret Societies,* hovers uneasily between the lunatic fringe that it strenuously repudiates and a more rigorous academic culture whose standards of evidence it struggles to meet.[5] Even J. M. Roberts's *The Mythology of the Secret Societies,* which more than any other book has brought secret societies within the pale of acceptable scholarship, describes itself as "a reconnaissance in an area of organized nonsense" (1).

Unfortunately, Roberts's self-deprecating label of his own subject matter as "nonsense" may encourage a misleading presentist dismissal of what, in the nineteenth century, was a widespread belief in and practice of De Quincey's "general economy of Secret Societies." As Roberts himself notes, "For about a century and a half large numbers of intelligent Europeans believed that much of what was happening in the world around them only happened because secret societies planned it so. . . . More believed such nonsense, probably, between 1815 and 1914 than at any other time" (102). One important example of the way in which this general "nonsensical" belief in the power of secret societies might translate into a more serious matter appears in Michael Ragussis's *Figures of Conversion*. Throughout his compelling exploration

of the role that the idea of Jewish conversion played in England from the 1790s through the 1870s, Ragussis demonstrates how the historical idea of the Iberian "crypto-Jew" allowed for the figuration of English Jews as members of a potentially subversive secret society.[6] In the case of the Jews, this kind of belief was catalyzed largely by the public prominence of Benjamin Disraeli. However, even the effect produced by Disraeli owes something to the existence of actual secret societies in the nineteenth century, as well as the presence of less-easy-to-define organizations like trade unions that employed secretive practices.

Such practices were not confined to revolutionary or working-class groups, however. James Eli Adams has shown how secretive practices analogous to those employed by the above societies were operative at Dr. Thomas Arnold's Rugby School and John Henry Newman's retreat at Littlemore.[7] In addition, as the following account from Bernard Becker indicates, institutional secrecy was clearly operative even in the Royal Society at the time of his visit in 1875:

> It will be seen that a visit to the halls of the Royal Society is not an expedition to be undertaken lightly, or in an irreverent spirit. He who seeks to be admitted to the sacred *penetralia,* where science sits enthroned among her chosen votaries, feels very much as he did on his first visit to the House of Lords, an institution which has much in common with the Royal Society. The would-be visitor must first look up a friendly F. R. S., who, if the applicant be deemed worthy, will introduce him to the acting secretary, Mr. White, who will enter his name on the book, bracketed with the name of the introducer, and he will now only have to present himself at the fashionable hour of 8.30 to be at once admitted to the Upper House of Science. (23)

Once admitted, the visitor would have been able to observe some of the ceremonies still operative at the time, including the ritualistic transferal of a silver mace from one speaker to another. Even more intriguing than Adams's and Becker's accounts of the divide between outsiders and initiates operative at Rugby, Littlemore and the Royal Society, however, is the following passage from Walter Bagehot's *The English Constitution:*

> The meetings are not only secret in theory, but secret in reality. By the present practice, no official minute is kept of them. Even a private note is discouraged and disliked. . . . The committee which unites the law-making power to the executive power—which, by virtue of that combination, is, while it lasts, the most powerful body in the state—is a committee wholly secret. No description of it, at once graphic and authentic, has ever been given. It is said to be sometimes like a rather

> disorderly board of directors, where many speak and few listen—but no one knows. (15–16)

One may be surprised to learn that the covert organization Bagehot so mysteriously describes is none other than the British Cabinet; however, this surprise is itself an indication of just how successful practices of secrecy, often reinforced by rituals like those witnessed by Becker, could be when institutionalized by respectable British organizations. In addition, Becker and Bagehot's accounts indicate the degree to which secretive, even seemingly conspiratorial, practices were acceptable when confined to the protected space of the elite public. The presence of such elite public secrecy adds yet another dimension to De Quincey's earlier fascination with the general economy of Secret Societies; secrecy was fascinating not only because it could be illicit and revolutionary, but also because it could be acceptable and indicative of public authority.

Among other things, the possible overlap of praxis from the Carbonari to the Cabinet documented in the above texts indicates the need for a less esoteric and more fluid definition of "secret society" than has yet been offered.[8] For the purposes of this book, I propose defining a secret society as "a social institution for which the practice of concealment forms an essential part of its praxis and/or self-definition." Such a definition has four distinct advantages. First, it removes the aura of bizarre para-scholarship from my investigation by allowing me to focus on more than just esoteric and occult societies like, for instance, the Rosicrucians. Second, this preliminary definition breaks down the false binary of secret/open society by allowing for a continuum of secrecy, with those societies which are invested exclusively in securing their own official nonexistence at one end and more public institutions with secretive practices at the other. Third, its value-neutral focus on institutional practices of concealment avoids the morally laden language of either condemnation or admiration with which the figure of the secret society was invested in Victorian England. Fourth, such an elastic definition better reflects the Victorians' own confusion about what exactly was meant by "secret society." The very flexibility of this definition also indicates the pressing need for a nuanced theory of secret societies as they functioned specifically within nineteenth-century English society.

II

This society, it is generally agreed, placed an exceptionally high premium on forthright honesty. In Victorian fiction one need look no farther than Bulstrode in George Eliot's *Middlemarch* to see how the public revelation of a simple act of concealment

can help to transform a prosperous banker into a social outcast already convicted of murder in the court of public opinion. Once one encounters more villainous characters—i.e. Uriah Heep, Sir John Chester, Sir Percival Glyde, even Becky Sharp—it becomes clear that what makes them morally questionable is their penchant for dishonesty. In his series of lectures at Harvard University on the subject of *Sincerity and Authenticity,* Lionel Trilling traces this narrative convention of the dissembling villain to the Early Modern period of English history:

> The original social meaning of the word "villain" bears decisively upon its later moral meaning. The opprobrious term referred to the man who stood lowest in the scale of feudal society; the villain of plays and novels is characteristically a person who seeks to rise above the station to which he was born. He is not what he is: this can be said of him both because by his intention he denies and violates his social identity and because he can achieve his unnatural purpose only by covert acts, by guile. (16)

Trilling also acknowledges that the value of personal honesty reached an historically unprecedented level in Victorian England, becoming "an element of personal autonomy" and "a progressive virtue" (47). Recently, John Kucich has gone a step further by exploring the class implications of this "hyper honesty" (6) [9]; Kucich's argument is complemented by Adams's contention that the Victorian period was devoted to a "*civic* ideal of manhood defined above all as an ideal of honest, straightforward conduct" opposed to "subtlety and obliquity of any kind" (65).

However, both Adams and Kucich also argue that this extreme emphasis on openness and truth-telling is only half of the story, that there was simultaneously an equally strong valuation of secrecy and lying. For Adams, the underlying elevation of secrecy in Victorian culture is tied to the concept of "manliness": paradoxically, even as Victorian men were encouraged to live up to the civic ideal of manhood outlined above, their status as gentlemen depended on their ability to subtly indicate that they were reserving an essential part of their characters from the public gaze. This performance of reserve leads Adams in *Dandies and Desert Saints* to reinsert the subversive and unstable figure of the dandy back into such popular Victorian constructions of manliness as the priest, the prophet, the soldier and the gentleman. In *The Power of Lies,* John Kucich offers a similar argument for the productive power of socially sanctioned lying, especially for elite middle-class professionals, cultural intellectuals and writers. For these groups, Kucich argues, lying could be ethically justified by ideals of self-development and social privilege. Since such justifications were most often used in Victorian fiction to underwrite the actions of middle-class characters, rendering them sympathetic despite their dissembling, Kucich concludes that middle-

class claims to cultural authority were grounded not only on a stable ideal of truth-telling, but also on a symbolic logic of transgression, signified by lying.

There are a number of potential explanations for why secrecy and lying came to occupy such a prominent role in Victorian culture.[10] In terms of symbolic logic, Kucich points to "the inevitable interdependence of oppositions between honesty and dishonesty in any symbolic system that reserves so prominent a place for issues of truthfulness" (15). In other words, truth-telling and openness only make sense when defined against lying and secrecy, which are thus elevated to a coequal position in a culture so obsessively concerned with personal integrity. In "Declarations of Independence," Jodi Dean historicizes Kucich's logical imperative using Jürgen Habermas's theory of the formation of the bourgeois public sphere, observing that what "Habermas conceptualizes as the bourgeois public sphere has early roots in secret societies; indeed, he allows that publicity itself, as a norm of reason, might require secrecy" (290). Dean's argument receives support in the work of Alexander Welsh and David Vincent, who in *George Eliot and Blackmail* and *The Culture of Secrecy,* respectively, identify the pressures that the dramatic development of a modern information culture placed on the private individual as an important incentive for personal secrecy. Welsh observes that Victorian novels with blackmail plots often endorse not a revelation, but a reconcealing, of the truth as the proper end of ethical behavior,[11] whereas Vincent uses the Post Office scandal of 1844—when it was discovered that the Post Office regularly opened suspicious mail, including potentially that of Radical MPs—as an introduction to ways in which certain forms of information were concealed from public view in the name of national security.[12] This practice often encouraged individuals to keep secrets from government inspectors and statisticians in an effort to preserve their privacy. This notion of individual privacy, and the private sphere more generally, was institutionalized by the Victorians, many of whom uncritically maintained a sharp distinction between secrecy and privacy. However, as numerous critics—including Adams, Kucich and Welsh, but also many feminist critics following the publication of Leonore Davidoff and Catharine Hall's *Family Fortunes* (1987)—have shown, the public and private spheres were never very separate. If the spheres in which they occur cannot be distinguished from another, then neither, I would argue, can secrecy and privacy be so neatly segregated. Therefore, since privacy was held in sufficiently high esteem to merit lying to government officials, it follows that secrecy enjoyed tacit valorization as well.

Together, these critics provide a compelling theoretical underpinning for the sort of multi-dimensional discourse of interiority to which we have already seen De Quincey appeal in his panegyric in honor of secret societies. Adding to the attractiveness of clandestine behavior was the legacy of Romantic individualism, with its overwhelming valuation of the secret self and the poetic soul, as well as the pressures of political

and economic instability, the shift from parish relief to government workhouses, and an increasingly extensive network of commercial relations that threatened to take the capacity for autonomy away from unreserved individuals. As Adams concisely notes, "Victorian obsessions with secrecy are manifold and powerfully overdetermined" (13), forming a pervasive rhetoric of secrecy operative during the Victorian period.

Within this larger rhetoric of secrecy the figure of the secret society occupies an intriguing position, linking individual secrecy with institutional practice. In thus moving secrecy from an individual to an institutional level, the figure of the secret society may initially appear amenable to Foucauldian methods of analysis. Foucault never discusses secret societies per se, but his elucidation of the individual secret of sexuality in *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1* and of the social secret of the disciplines and panopticism in *Discipline and Punish* leaves ample room for the inclusion of secret societies and the rhetoric of conspiracy they help to foster under his explanatory rubric. Not only would secret societies foster the same type of disciplinary instruction encouraged by the larger society—loyalty, docility, normalization, an emphasis on the center point of secrecy—but public suspicion and fear of their existence would provide the perfect excuse for the productive extension of universal surveillance. This second function is exactly the point of E. P. Thompson's assertion that, in the first twenty years of the nineteenth century, "the Government *needed* conspirators, to justify the continuation of repressive legislation which prevented nation-wide popular organization" (485). If anything, secret societies work even better than secretive individuals for maintaining social order because, whereas it is theoretically possible to incarcerate all individual subversives, it can never be unambiguously ascertained whether a given society has been definitely eradicated or has simply enveloped itself in a deeper shroud of secrecy, thus allowing for the spatial and temporal expansion of government surveillance.

However, such a Foucauldian account of secrecy and its implications for the productive function of secret societies would leave one with an insufficiently complex understanding of how secret societies actually functioned in nineteenth-century England. While it is true that many political invocations of the figure of the secret society were made to serve conservative ends, a purely Foucauldian explanation, by making the secret society just another ruse of power, fails to account for individual resistance to such rhetorical maneuvering.[13] That resistance can take place through the formation of secret societies is exactly the point of nineteenth-century sociologist Georg Simmel's observation that in general "the secret society emerges everywhere as the counterpart of despotism and police restriction, as the protection of both the defensive and the offensive in their struggle against the overwhelming pressures of central powers—by no means of political powers only, but also of the church, as

well as of social classes and families" (347). In fact, such resistance to "the overwhelming pressures of the central power" was the primary aim of many actual secret societies in nineteenth-century Britain, with the numerous secretive associations in Ireland providing the clearest example of just how effective sustained practices of secrecy could be for producing real social change—i.e., Catholic emancipation, the disestablishment of the Irish Church, and the eventual nullification of the Act of Union.[14]

In order to appreciate this potential for resistance, one must look beyond the idealized political perspective of those already in positions of power. Government officials and many prominent social and scientific figures would be at great pains to dampen the revolutionary potential of secret societies by containing it within their own hegemonic system, often by practicing secretive behavior themselves. Again, Simmel is instructive here when he observes that there exists "the peculiar attractiveness of formally secretive behavior irrespective of its momentary content. In the first place, the strongly emphasized exclusion of all outsiders makes for a correspondingly strong feeling of possession" (332). Among the social group possessed of a secret, these shared senses of exclusivity and possession promote solidarity and fuel the kind of fascination with secretive behavior evinced by De Quincey. Depending upon its members and their social position, the group may also accrue either social prestige or social disapprobation if the existence of the secret is made more widely known. In other words, once a secret society has entered the political realm, once it has become a figure in the exterior middle-class rhetoric of secrecy, its publicity can be used to undermine whatever revolutionary potential the society might originally have had either by implicating it within a system of social authority based on the exclusion of others or by fostering public condemnation of its dangerously secretive practices. From the perspective of those in power, neither strategy of publicity is risk-free: socially sanctioned practices of institutional secrecy look suspicious if they are made too public and may destabilize the binary opposition between acceptable and unacceptable forms of secrecy on which the condemnation of potentially revolutionary societies relies. This binary opposition is further threatened by the aesthetic, spiritual and intersubjective enthusiasm such societies may inspire. Nevertheless, for those interested in the uneven distribution of social power, the figure of the secret society remains an attractive way of preserving their own position.

III

In Victorian England, the uneven distribution of social power became the major focus of the century-long debate over democracy. Derived from the Greek words *demos,* or "people," and *kratia,* "rule" or "power," democracy was under enormous pressure

in the nineteenth century. On the one hand, the American and French Revolutions had revived democracy as a political theory uniquely suited to the modern state. On the other hand, democracy as it had been originally conceived, if not actually practiced, in ancient Athens was no longer possible, mainly because of the impracticable number of potential voters. Representative democracy mediated by institutions, what Robert Dahl refers to as polyarchy,[15] seemed the logical answer to an enlarged population, but the fundamental question remained: who were the "people" and how much "power" ought they to have?[16] The various positive answers given to this question in the nineteenth century can be broken down into two main "pro-democracy" positions: 1) radical or ideal democracy, in which the principle of guaranteed total equality among persons, often but not always translated as the political advocacy of universal suffrage, was considered "self-evident" and inherent in what it meant to be human; and 2) guardianship democracy, in which equality was something to be earned, often through education, by the lower orders, whose interests would be looked after in the meantime by middle-and/or upper-class guardians who would govern in their stead.[17] The implications of these two positions for the terms "people" and "power" are fairly evident. Radical democracy interprets both terms in as literal and as broad a manner as possible—all residents over a given age constitute the people, whose power, equally distributed among these individual residents, should immediately be the will of the nation. Seen in the most sympathetic light, guardianship democracy might allow for a similar definition of these key terms, but only as a future ideal. A less sympathetic reading influenced by historical precedent, however, would probably agree with C. Douglas Lummis that "As a general rule when middle- and upper-class people in whatever country say that they support 'people's power,' what they mean by 'the people' is themselves" (15), with a correspondingly truncated definition of power.

These implications for the terms "people" and "power" also lead to more theoretical implications about the goals of democracy for England's domestic and international policies. Radical democracy again conceives of itself in comprehensive terms; it seeks not particular social institutions, but a social ideal of empowered individual equality. Within England this meant working to overturn the centuries-long domination of national affairs by the landed Protestant aristocracy, whereas abroad it could lead to a repudiation of British imperialism. By contrast, guardianship democracy limits itself to institutional forms, including popular education, open election of representatives, and perhaps legal guarantee of certain democratic rights (i.e., free speech) even as it preserves traditional divisions of people along, in the case of Victorian England, class, religious and racial lines. These divisions were especially strong in the colonies, where the strict maintenance of a rigid social hierarchy was the foundation of Britain's imperial policies. In their extreme forms, then, radical and guardian-

ship democracy differ substantially on key issues, and this difference is important to maintain if one is to understand what was at stake in the Victorian debate over democracy.

In some ways the terms of this Victorian debate had already been established by earlier public confrontations over democracy, most noticeably those between Edmund Burke and Thomas Paine, and between James Mill and Thomas Macaulay. The substance of Edmund Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1791) and Thomas Paine's *The Rights of Man* (1791–92) are well-known: the principal point at issue between them was whether Britain should retain its constitutionally validated social hierarchy of the people and their upper-class guardians, or whether the people ought to take a more active and radical role in their own republican democracy.[18] More recently, James Mill's "Essay on Government" (1820) had provided an equally radical Utilitarian argument for representative democracy. Specifically, after rejecting an Athenian-style model of democracy as unsuited for the much greater size of the modern electorate,[19] Mill's "Essay" proposed a representative democracy founded on universal suffrage and frequent elections as the best way to insure that the greatest happiness principle would be perpetuated by the government.[20] Macaulay successfully repudiated Mill's conclusions on two grounds. First, he criticized Mill's lack of tangible evidence, declaring that "We have here an elaborate treatise on Government, from which, but for two or three passing allusions, it would not appear that the author was aware that any governments actually existed among men" ("Mill's Essay," 161–62). Second, in what would become a staple of guardianship theories advocated by both those in favor of and those in opposition to some version of democracy, he argued that the forces of public opinion and personal reputation are sufficient to guarantee that the aristocracy will always govern with everyone's best interests in mind, and that the only thing universal suffrage could achieve would be a despoliation of the rich by the poor, resulting in social chaos and a worse life for all.

The crucial addition to these earlier debates, and perhaps the single most influential work on democratic theory written in the nineteenth century, is Alexis de Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*.[21] This two-volume magnum opus offers nothing less than a comprehensive overview of the political and social practices, individual and societal effects, and practical and theoretical implications of democracy as suggested by its implementation in the United States of America. Tocqueville begins by explaining that his purpose is neither to advance nor to prevent the spread of democracy to Europe—a spread that he believes inevitable in any case because it is the will of God—but rather to suggest ways in which the democratization of Europe might learn from the American example before it is too late: "Christian peoples in our day appear to me to offer a frightening spectacle; the movement [toward social

equality] that carries them along is already strong enough that it cannot be suspended, but it is not yet rapid enough to despair of directing it: their fate is in their hands, but soon it will escape them" (7). Democracy requires guidance because, although it remains for Tocqueville the best way of both insuring individual freedom and fostering a sense of mutual interdependence or community, it is also susceptible to a number of dangerous tendencies. Theoretically, democracy produces an inherent tension between individual equality and individual liberty; taken to its extreme, this tension can actually result in the sacrifice of liberty in order to maintain equality.[22] Such a sacrifice becomes practically evident in what Tocqueville identifies as a "tyranny of majority" operative in the United States at the levels of legislation and, most insidiously, of public opinion. In other words, the numerical majority tends to pass laws and prompt judgments that are despotically homogeneous in that they silence minority opposition.[23] In addition to these two primary dangers, democracy's focus on individual equality also risks producing both atomistic individuals and oppression of the wealthy, as well as allowing for the formation of despotic sects that purport to represent the majority even as they pursue their own self-serving goals. None of these tendencies is unavoidable, says Tocqueville—in fact all can be effectively combated by publicity in a free press—but it is up to those nations progressing inevitably toward social equality to determine whether "equality leads them to servitude or freedom, to enlightenment or barbarism, to prosperity or misery" (676).

Immediately translated into English in 1835 and 1840, Tocqueville's even-handed and thoughtful appraisal of democracy and its dangers exercised enormous influence over English reformers struggling to cope with the growing popular demand for more direct political representation in Britain. Two reviews of *Democracy in America* written by John Stuart Mill give some indication of Tocqueville's English reception. Both reviews agree that the book ranks "among the most remarkable productions of our times" (*Essays,* 198),[24] with Mill's second review going so far as to declare that *Democracy in America* heralds "the beginning of a new era in the scientific study of politics" and that "nothing on the whole comparable in profundity . . . had yet been written on democracy will scarcely be disputed by anyone" (*Essays,* 232, 275). In addition, whereas his first review had attempted to palliate somewhat Tocqueville's fears about a "tyranny of the majority" (*Essays,* 220–25), Mill's second, considerably lengthier review not only endorses Tocqueville's conclusions,[25] but goes on to offer evidence for the relevance of *Democracy in America* for an English audience. Mill writes,

> If America has been said to prove, that in an extensive country a popular government may exist, England seems destined to afford the proof, that after a certain stage in civilization it must; for as soon as the numerically stronger have the same advantages, in means of combination and celerity of movement, as the stronger

> number, they are the masters; and, except by their permission, no government can any longer exist. (*Essays,* 243)

He then points out numerous similarities between England and the United States (*Essays* 278–82), arguing ultimately that in order to guide democracy in England away from the tyranny of the majority, self-absorption and love of wealth evident in America, there should be established a separate "social support for opinions and sentiments different from those of the mass" (*Essays,* 284).

As one might expect, neither Burke's and Macaulay's early successes nor Tocqueville's *Democracy in America* silenced advocates of radical democracy.[26] However, those earlier debates, and Tocqueville's warning that democracy could produce a conflict between equality and liberty and a "tyranny of the majority," provided a set of terms within which to advocate more limited forms of democratic guardianship. In order to illustrate the range of specific opinions that could fall under this general term, I will present four versions of guardianship democracy proposed by Thomas Macaulay, Walter Bagehot, W. R. Greg and John Stuart Mill. Each of these men characterized himself as "pro-democracy" in the sense that each argued that his political position offered the best method for securing the rights of "the people," and all believed that England remained unsuited for radical democracy in the form of universal suffrage. However, their reasons for this common belief are strikingly different. Macaulay's *History of England* (1848–61) presents the English Constitution as sufficiently adaptable not to require dramatic revisions of the kind the Chartists proposed. Bagehot's *The English Constitution* (1867) also endorses the effectiveness of the present Constitution, not because of its adaptability but because of its "effective secret" of the Cabinet. By contrast, W. R. Greg in "Representative Reform" (1852) cautions against universal suffrage on the grounds that sufficient education is the necessary precondition for the franchise. Finally, John Stuart Mill's *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform* (1859) and *Considerations on Representative Government* (1861) agree with Greg that education remains the necessary precondition for the franchise and propose an elaborate system of political representation designed to limit the ability of the under-educated majority to exercise tyranny over their intellectual superiors. What unites these diverse writers is their shared conviction that some form of guardianship would be necessary to save democracy from its own excesses.

For Thomas Macaulay, whose public career was launched by his early opposition to James Mill's "Essay on Government" and to Utilitarianism more generally, radical democracy is rendered unnecessary by the adaptable excellence of the Constitution of 1688. As portrayed in *The History of England,* this Constitution manages to answer the demands of the future by preserving the best of the past: "The

main principles of our government were excellent. They were not, indeed, formally and exactly set forth in a single written instrument: but they were to be found scattered over our ancient and noble statutes; and, what was of far greater moment, they had been engraven on the hearts of Englishmen during four hundred years" (*History,* III: 282).[27] For Macaulay, the continued worth of these principles is demonstrated by the resulting peacefulness of England:

> The highest eulogy which can be pronounced on the revolution of 1688 is this, that it was our last revolution. Several generations have now passed away since any wise and patriotic Englishman has meditated resistance to the established government. In all honest and reflecting minds there is a conviction, daily strengthened by experience, that the means of effecting every improvement which the constitution requires can be found within the constitution itself. (*History,* III: 287)

Since the Constitution of 1688 provides within itself the mechanisms for its own revision, radical proposals to alter it by introducing the points of the People's Charter are without merit. The balance already in place between the monarchy, the House of Lords and the House of Commons as presently constituted would ensure that the rights of the people are being preserved by the competing interests of the crown, the aristocracy and the commons, and that England would never suffer the kind of "destroying revolution" already witnessed in France in 1789, 1830 and 1848 (*History,* III: 288).[28]

Walter Bagehot also endorses the excellence of the Constitution of 1688, though for somewhat different reasons. Bagehot divides England into "the educated ten thousand" and everyone else, and observes that the "lower orders, the middle orders, are still, when tried by what is the standard of the educated 'ten thousand,' narrow-minded, unintelligent, incurious" (7). For Bagehot, the excellence of the Constitution of 1688 is that it accounts for this division of England by providing a portion of the government suitable for each group. He theorizes that the venerable, "dignified" parts of the constitution—mainly the monarchy, and to a lesser extent the House of Lords—are there to impress and motivate the lower orders through theatricality. For the educated ten thousand, the Constitution provides for the union of the executive and the legislative branches via the cabinet, which Bagehot describes as "the efficient secret of the English Constitution" (12). In other words, the queen secures the loyalty, respect and deference of the masses for the government as a whole, while only a small part of that government, the cabinet, does all of the important work behind closed doors.[29] Bagehot believes that the cabinet is uniquely positioned to govern effectively because it is not subject to direct democratic control. Instead, it is elected by the country's elected representatives,

who, on the whole, are considerably wiser than their electors.[30] In fact, he identifies the process of electing the Prime Minister, who selects the cabinet, as the single most important function of the House of Commons.[31] Bagehot also considers and rejects what he calls the "ultra-democratic theory" of universal suffrage for two reasons: first, "Such a Parliament could not be composed of moderate men" (182); second, "A country of respectful poor, though far less happy than where there are no poor to be respectful, is nevertheless far more fitted for the best government. You can use the best classes of the respectful country; you can only use the worst where every man thinks he is as good as every other" (54).

In contrast to Bagehot, W. R. Greg's opposition to universal suffrage stems from what he perceives as the fundamental principle of the Reform Bill of 1832. According to Greg, the First Reform Bill established a precedent that "the elective franchise was not a right inherent in every man by virtue of his residence in a free country, but an instrument for the attainment of a national end" (454). As he sees it, this precedent means that whereas the 1832 Bill was "at once *conservative* and *popular,*" subsequent attempts to expand the franchise "would be assuredly at once *democratic* and *retrogressive*" even if "just wise and necessary (as to which we here offer no opinion)" (457). In essence, universal suffrage would be retrogressive because it would lower the standards required to vote. Greg approves of the enfranchisement of the intelligent and educated middle class, but is distrustful of similar working-class goals, mainly because he sees education as the fundamental condition for the suffrage. As he recognizes, enfranchising the working classes "would throw the entire of the preponderating control over that representation—in other words, the supreme power of the State, into their hands" by virtue of their superior numbers (460–61). However, without proper education, these new voters would have the potential to exercise a "tyranny of the majority" (465–69). For Greg, making the franchise dependent on education would preserve the principles of the First Reform Bill by acknowledging both that the right to vote is something "endowed," not something inherent, and that its endowment depends upon one's ability to "exercise it for their country's good" (471). Presumably this ability would be rated by those who had already achieved the proper level of education to assume the mantle of guardianship.

Finally, there is John Stuart Mill, whose ultimate allegiance to either radical or guardianship democracy is a bit more complex. On the one hand Mill's position on electoral reform has certain affinities with Macaulay's, Bagehot's, and Greg's. Like Macaulay, Mill is concerned to preserve a balance of power among England's diverse social orders and to inculcate in individuals the habit of obedience to recognized authorities (*Considerations,* 74). Like Bagehot, Mill wishes to insure that England's leaders are the best available and he believes that "No progress at all can be made towards obtaining a skilled democracy, unless the democracy are willing that the

work which requires skill should be done by those who possess it" (*Considerations,* 117). Finally, like Greg, Mill values education:

> I regard it as wholly inadmissable that any person should participate in the suffrage, without being able to read, write, and, I will add, perform the common operations of arithmetic. Justice demands, even when the suffrage does not depend on it, that the means of attaining these elementary acquirements should be within the reach of every person, either gratuitously, or at an expense not exceeding what the poorest, who earn their own living, can afford. (*Considerations,* 167)[32]

On the other hand, Mill also supports expanding the franchise, and this support may make his argument initially more difficult to classify. In *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform* he argues that "It is important that every one of the governed should have a voice in government" (*Essays,* 338). He would expand on this argument two years later:

> There is no difficulty in showing that the ideally best form of government is that in which the sovereignty or supreme controlling power in the last resort, is vested in the entire aggregate of the community; every citizen not only having a voice in the exercise of that ultimate sovereignty, but being, at least occasionally, called on to take actual part in the government, by the personal discharge of some public function, local or general. (*Considerations,* 53)

Mill even goes so far as to recommend suffrage for women as well as men, a position far in advance of his time.[33]

At first, this conviction that all of the governed ought to have a voice in their government looks like radical democracy; however, Mill's fears about a potential conflict between liberty and equality and a "tyranny of the majority" lead him to place limitations on such popular sovereignty. These fears are best expressed by Mill's attempt to define the concept of democracy: "Two very different ideas are usually confounded under the name democracy. The pure idea of democracy, according to its definition, is the government of the whole people by the whole people, equally represented. Democracy as commonly conceived and hitherto practiced, is the government of the whole people by a mere majority of the people, exclusively represented" (*Considerations,* 132). This second conception of democracy Mill sees as prone to "the domination of sectional or class interests, pointing to conduct which would be dictated by impartial regard for the interest of all" (*Considerations,* 120). In thus characterizing the common conception of democracy, Mill leaves himself open to criticism from at least three kinds of radical democrats: 1) working-class radicals might reply

that a government of the whole people by a mere majority is probably less prone to sectional or class interests than the extant government of the whole people by a mere minority has shown itself to be; 2) utilitarians would argue that the function of government is to secure the "greatest happiness principle" and that majority rule achieves that by definition; 3) contemporary Marxist radicals could reply that the current mode of capitalist production renders all claims to govern according to the "impartial regard for the interest of all" suspect on a number of grounds, the most charitable of which is false consciousness.[34] For Mill, however, the threat of a tyranny by newly enfranchised manual laborers is real, leading him in *Thoughts* to append to his conviction that everyone ought to have a voice the question, "But ought everyone to have an *equal* voice?" (*Essays,* 339). In fact, Mill believes that one's voice ought to be determined by one's "individual mental superiority" (*Considerations,* 175),[35] and he proposes an elaborate electoral scheme designed to insure both that the educated minority would remain a potent force in every election,[36] and that Parliament would contain "the very élite of the country" (*Considerations,* 145). Even allowing Mill the most sympathetic meaning of "élite," one cannot help but place him among the many supporters of guardianship democracy, since these élite and their super-enfranchised, intellectually superior supporters would serve as guardians for a common good only they would be equipped to determine.

As these four thinkers make clear, there were many reasons in the nineteenth century for opposing radical democracy. Tradition, effectiveness, education, and the maintenance of independent minorities might all lead one to advise against such radical goals as universal suffrage, at least for now. However, alongside these reasons should be placed another, somewhat less disinterested motive. As Alexis de Tocqueville asked in 1835, "Does one think that after having destroyed feudalism and vanquished kings, democracy will recoil before the bourgeoisie and the rich?" (6).[37] At its most radical, democracy would do away with all of the sources of social inequality, including those founded on the uneven distribution of wealth. This is not to say that all radical democrats in the nineteenth-century were socialists, although many, like William Morris, did seek to fundamentally change the way industrialism worked. Instead, what I mean to suggest is that nineteenth-century advocates of guardianship democracy realized that once the principle of equality found social acceptance, there was no telling where it might lead. Jon Roper lucidly summarizes the efforts of many to control democracy's possibilities: "In a society which recognized the antagonisms of class, therefore, there were those who argued that democracy—as it implied an equal right to liberty—would disrupt the habits of social deference. They searched for alternative methods of checking the social ideal" (15), or limiting democratic reform to such an extent that the principle of equality would not come into conflict with Victorian England's well-established social hierarchies.

IV

One such "alternative method" was the strategic political invocation of the figure of the secret society. To understand how the figure of the secret society could play a role in "checking the social ideal," one must consider the specific actors involved in each invocation, a task I will take up in detail in the following chapters. In the context of the debates over democracy, the figure of the secret society was often deployed by advocates of guardianship democracy to discredit those whose actions furthered more radical ends.[38] This is not to say that there were no "true believers" in the influence that secret societies could have on England's political future, but rather that even the apparently sincere belief of such Victorian "conspiracy theorists" as Charles Newdegate and David Urquhart differed little in results from the more opportunistic accusations of conspiracy leveled by political propagandists concerned only with preserving the status quo. That, to borrow J. M. Roberts's formulation, such an interested "delusion of the directing class . . . was able to have great political and practical effects" (8), securing public condemnation and governmental repression, is due to the ways in which the figure of the secret society effaces the gap in social power that enables its deployment. Once it has been invoked, several loosely affiliated individuals striving for democratic social change become the leaders of a powerfully unified conspiracy whose clandestine goals are subject to the wildest speculation. Certainly the secretive and hierarchical nature of the secret society itself demonstrates that these goals cannot be radically democratic: not only must the group have something unsavory to hide, but the fact that it is being led by a select group of individuals smacks of a form of despotic guardianship. If allowed to prosper, such a group would create an even worse balance of power than already exists. What is needed is a strong, open democracy governed by guardians equipped to counteract this kind of "un-English" behavior.

Such, at least, was the reaction the figure of the secret society was supposed to elicit towards those groups whose acts threatened the current delineation of social and political authority. Once fully public, however, the figure of the secret society never remained so monologically stable. Within the political realm, radical critics tended to question its tautological collapse of secrecy and despotism and to point out that such conspiratorial paranoia was self-perpetuating, even without a legitimate object. Many more moderate critics also remained uncomfortable with a standard of meaning that claimed to differentiate between "English" and "un-English" institutions purely on the absence or presence of secretive practices. Some were themselves members of "respectable" organizations like Parliament, the Royal Society,

or the growing number of professional associations, all of whose methods for dividing outsiders from initiates were difficult to separate from similar practices by less acceptable groups. Ironically, perhaps the most far-reaching political critique of the figure of the secret society and of guardianship theories of democracy was already present in *Democracy in America* itself. At the end of Volume Two, Tocqueville worries that the greatest danger inherent in democracy is its vulnerability to the despotic influence of "an immense and tutelary power . . . which takes charge of assuring their [the people's] enjoyments and watching over their fate. It is absolute, detailed, regular, far-seeing, and mild" (663).[39] As an antidote to this almost Foucauldian vision of despotic guardianship, Tocqueville advocates the need for powerful private associations dedicated to securing everyone's equal right to liberty,[40] in other words for those organizations of the under-enfranchised that were often pejoratively represented by the figure of the secret society.

Outside of these objections to monologically negative invocations of the figure of the secret society were a host of less overtly political reasons why institutional secrecy might meet with qualified approbation. Practices of secrecy offered not just an avenue for social and political resistance but also a retreat from the public pressures of society and politics. Within this extra-political space, secrecy could provide a means for and a measure of spiritual and aesthetic self-development. Moreover, when such secrecy was institutionalized to govern the collective practices of a group of like-minded individuals, it could promote a sense of intellectual community and historical continuity. This positive dimension of the figure of the secret society remains in constant tension with the political pressures of the ongoing debate over democracy, thereby producing a complex dialectic on the subject of institutional secrecy in the Parliamentary debates, the periodical press, and the popular fiction of the Victorian period.

My first chapter establishes the allure of secrecy, especially for the more privileged members of Victorian society, by, first, examining the rhetoric surrounding one particular secret society, English Freemasonry, and, second, tracing the related political implications of Thomas Carlyle's praise of secrecy in *Sartor Resartus* (1833–34). Specifically exempted from the restrictions placed on private associations in the Combination Acts of 1799, the Masons enjoyed noble, even royal, patronage for the whole of the nineteenth century. They held parades, published journals and provided charitable assistance to widows and orphans, all while carefully cultivating an image of institutional secrecy. Public approbation of their activities suggests that, so long as it remained the protected space of the elite public, secrecy enjoyed widespread acceptance in Victorian England. In fact, secrecy could be not merely accepted, but valorized, as it is in Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus,* which presents the reader with a metaphysics of heroic signification that is built on the positive valuation of

silence and secrecy. Carlyle's theory of secrecy is important not only because, as George Eliot admitted in 1855, "there is hardly a superior or active mind of this generation that has not been modified by Carlyle's writings, and especially by *Sartor Resartus*" (187–88), but also because his theory, together with the example of the Masons, shows that positive valuations of secrecy and vehement opposition to democracy could be mutually supportive.

The next three chapters illustrate how this positive valuation of secrecy complicates attempts to pejoratively label as secret societies constituencies supposedly unfit for democratic representation by virtue of their class, religion or race. Chapter 2 reexamines accusation that trade unions were dangerous secret societies by focusing on the 1838 trial of five Glasgow cotton spinners for conspiracy and murder. During the trial and its aftermath in Parliamentary and periodical debates, these men, and through them the working classes, were condemned as dangerous conspirators akin to the Indian Thugs. Intended to demonstrate the working class's unfitness for full participation in English democracy, this invocation of the figure of the secret society did not go wholly uncontested. I trace some of the implications of this resistance through the arguments of a small number of MPs and periodical writers, as well as through Charles Dickens's *Barnaby Rudge* (1841) and Benjamin Disraeli's *Sybil* (1845). Both novels absorb the range of debate over the trial in their representations of trade unions as secret societies; however, both also extend this method of representation to middle- and upper-class associations as well. This extension suggests that secretive practices operate at all levels of English society and therefore that such practices cannot serve as a reliable indication of any group's fitness for democratic enfranchisement.

Both novels also locate their representations of trade unions within the social context of English anti-Catholicism, itself a prolific source of secret society references. In fact, charges similar to those made against the Spinners were also applied to English Catholics, only instead of being labeled Thugs, Anglo- and Roman Catholics were represented using the figure of Jesuitism. Chapter 3 concentrates explicitly on Protestant fears of various Catholic and Catholic-like conspiracies as articulated during 1) the debate over Catholic emancipation, 2) the Tractarian controversy of the 1830s, and 3) the public uproar prompted by the reestablishment of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Britain in 1850. By interrogating responses to these manifestations of the Catholic Question in a wide range of Victorian nonfiction prose, I reveal the extent to which Victorian anti-Catholic and nationalist rhetorics become increasingly conflated through the figure of Jesuitism. In 1829, the vast majority of English anti-Catholics vilified foreign and domestic Papists alike, but by 1850 their denunciations had become much more particular, excoriating only the papacy for the international threat it posed to all patriotic Englishmen, both Catholic and Protestant.[41] In thus collapsing reli-

gion and politics together, however, anti-Catholic nationalists left themselves open to ideological critique by both moderate Protestants committed to catholicity and Roman Catholic apologists quick to reverse conspiratorial accusations by appealing to the aesthetic and spiritual attractiveness of secretive practices. In addition, by using accusations of conspiracy to denounce only foreign Catholics, mid-century anti-Catholic propagandists began to weaken the connection between the figure of the secret society and democratic reform, thereby sacrificing one of their central arguments, that Catholics did not deserve equal citizenship. The result of counter-offensive texts aware of this rhetorical shift, like John Henry Newman's *Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England* (1850), is similar to the implication of Dickens and Disraeli's novels: that secretive practices cannot diminish one's entitlement to English democracy.

In Chapter 4, I investigate the similarly strained marriage of politics and religion through the figure of the secret society that took place during England's response to the Indian Mutiny. As one writer for *The British Quarterly Review* wryly noted, "Never before, in any era of its Parliamentary history, had this country to decide upon a case of such magnitude, with so little of the preparation necessary to decide upon it wisely" ("India as it is—India as it may be," 203). In the absence of wisdom, many English statesmen and writers fell back on the familiar rhetoric of secret conspiracies to explain how the Indian army's religious objections to a new rifle could lead to armed rebellion. From religious differences, English attempts to explain affairs in India quickly turned to questions of race, with the figure of the secret society neatly eliding the difference. This strategy of refiguring the rebellion as a conspiracy efficiently 1) silenced those advocating direct representation for the Indians by demonstrating their unsuitability for open democratic institutions; 2) limited the spread of the rebellion by confining it to the actions of a few conspirators; 3) generated a rhetoric of Carlylean heroism to justify the English and their rule in India; and 4) supported a burgeoning rhetoric of British racism. These results of secreting rebellion come under critical scrutiny in Wilkie Collins's *The Moonstone* (1868). Collins's novel employs several techniques, including temporal and spatial doubling, to return British heroes to earth and reveal their complicity in and responsibility for the Indian rebellion, thereby undercutting any blanket assertions about Indians,' or any other "dark race's," inferiority to their light-skinned colonial "guardians."

When, only months later, English attention turned to the unification of Italy, the combined rhetoric of democracy and secrecy became increasingly implicated in ideological conflict. Chapter 5 navigates among the competing claims of politics, trade, class, religion, race and empire raised by the Italian Question to show how the Victorians' resulting ideological relativism combined with their divided attitudes towards secrecy to frustrate any attempt to assert ideological order by invoking the figure

of the secret society. Everyone involved in reunifying Italy, from the Pope to Napoleon III to Victor Emmanuel to Garibaldi, seemed complicit in a wide range of plots and conspiracies, making it difficult for their supporters in England to retain any ideological high ground on the subject of secrecy. Two literary texts that appeared during the messy resolution of the Italian Question deploy the figure of the secret society in their critiques of England's ideological confusion. Published in 1859–60, during the first period of Italian unification, Wilkie Collins's *The Woman in White* represents the ambivalent attractiveness of the Italian figure of the secret society through the character of Count Fosco, an Italian conspirator and arch-villain who nevertheless remains one of the most problematically charismatic figures in the novel. Benjamin Disraeli's *Lothair* (1870), which appeared the same year that Italian unification was finally achieved, presents Italy and England as overflowing with the conspiratorial machinations of an explosion of factual and fictional secret societies. Both novels help to dramatize the chaotic rhetoric surrounding Italian unification and to reveal the kind of ideological relativism brought on by English responses to the Italian Question. In addition, *Lothair* offers evidence that, since 1850 and certainly by 1870, the significance of England's rhetoric of conspiracy had begun to change, an issue I take up briefly in my final Afterword.

Ultimately, I intend to establish that, far from being a mere "aberration of maturing bourgeois society" (J. M. Roberts 2), the figure of the secret society actually played an ideologically central and largely overlooked role in the ongoing development of that society. In the first two-thirds of the nineteenth-century, the ongoing connection between accusations of secrecy and the period's tumultuous debate over the character of England's emerging democracy means that the figure of the secret society can serve as a useful barometer for Victorian England's failure to manifest its promise of universal political subjecthood. Liberal interpretations of the post-Enlightenment doctrine of "natural rights" simultaneously appealed to universalist notions of equality in order to justify electoral reform and the preeminent status of the Commons even as they sought to keep undesirable constituencies perpetually disenfranchised by branding them secret societies. These accusations were intended to deny groups like trade unionists, English Catholics and colonized peoples the chance to assert themselves as citizens by representing them as non-subjects—they could not be trusted to vote, for example, because their ties to clandestine organizations precluded their ability to function as autonomous individuals.[42] What I will argue throughout this book is that such "plots of opportunity" should be viewed with extreme suspicion, since they usually indicate that the ideals of democratic equality and political universalism are being circumvented in an effort to perpetuate an uneven distribution of social power.

1

Authorized Secrecy: The Figure of Freemasonry, Carlyle's Clothes Philosophy and an Alternative to Democracy

"To what extent Democracy has now reached, how it advances irresistible with ominous, ever-increasing speed, he that will open his eyes on any province of human affairs may discern," writes Thomas Carlyle in *Past and Present* (1843). He continues, "Democracy is everywhere the inexorable demand of these ages, swiftly fulfilling itself. From the thunder of Napoleon battles, to the jabberings of Open-vestry in St. Mary Axe, all things announce Democracy" (*Works,* 10: 215). For Carlyle, the problem with the "Morrison's Pill" of democracy is that it proposes an exclusively political solution to what he perceives as a fundamentally spiritual problem. Democracy's universal panacea of the vote will not give people the intellectual, moral and spiritual development that he believes they so desperately need. Much of Carlyle's own writing can be seen as an attempt to impart and justify the value of such extra-political attributes, and thereby to secure for himself a degree of social authority that the Victorian period's overwhelming focus on democracy would prevent him from gaining.

As the example of De Quincey makes evident, Carlyle is hardly alone in his attempt to establish his own authority by shifting from a political to an aesthetic/spiritual register. In fact, Carlyle's frequent reliance on a discourse of secretive interiority rhetorically links him to the practices of Victorian England's single most prominent exception to the general distrust of clandestine organizations, namely English Freemasonry. Although an avowed secret society, Freemasonry remained something of an accepted institution throughout the Victorian period. Just how accepted can be seen from the Unlawful Societies Act of 1799, which contains a clause specifically

exempting English Freemasonry from the otherwise universal prohibition of oath-taking. Inserted largely as a result of efforts by the Duke of Atholl and the Earl of Moira, the Grand Masters of the two branches of English Freemasonry operative at the time, this clause not only allowed English Masons to continue practicing their craft, it also granted them official recognition from the Crown, and therefore an unusual degree of authorized secrecy.[1]

The Masons worked hard to retain this authority by projecting a combination of divinely inspired mystery and apolitical respectability to the general public. Since throughout the nineteenth century Freemasonry was the subject of numerous exposés like those by Abbé Barruel and John Robison, many of them written by former members and therefore offering detailed descriptions of Masonic "mysteries," the "fact" of Freemasonry was something of an open secret; at the same time, partly as a result of this publicity and partly due to the Masons' preservation of ritualistic practices that they claimed were designed to preserve and perpetuate certain divine truths of which they were the guardians, the "figure" of Freemasonry continued to evoke a sense of aesthetically pleasurable secrecy and spiritual authority among the general public. The Masons then supplemented this aura of figurative secrecy with an image of institutional respectability. Unlike their counterparts on the Continent, English Freemasons always remained scrupulously apolitical, concentrating their energies on public parades and charitable causes. In addition, like the many professional organizations from which it drew its members, English Masonry published a number of "trade" journals, including the *Sentimental and Masonic Magazine* (est. 1792–94), the *Freemasons' Journal: or Paley's Universal Intelligence* (est. 1795), the *Free-Mason's Magazine* (est. 1793–98), the *Freemasons' Quarterly Review* (est. 1834–49), the *Freemasons' Quarterly Magazine and Review* (est. 1850–52), the *Freemasons' Quarterly Magazine* (est. 1853–54), the *Freemason's Monthly Magazine* (est. 1855–58), and the *Freemasons' Magazine and Masonic Mirror* (est. 1859–71).[2]

The success of English Freemasonry's campaign for institutional respectability suggests that the discourse of interiority that they shared with De Quincey and Carlyle has the rhetorical power to reveal another dimension of the period's middle-class ethos of transparent openness. In this chapter I use the Freemasons' exceptional acceptance as a point of entry into this more positive side to Victorian England's dynamic rhetoric of secrecy. I examine how several Victorian authors invoke the figure of Freemasonry in an attempt to establish an alternative set of standards according to which institutional forms of secrecy might not be just acceptable but even attractive. I then turn to the secret practices of English Freemasonry itself in order to illustrate how a careful manipulation of political, aesthetic and spiritual registers of meaning contributed to the Masons' respectable status. However, although the English Freemasons are the most recognizable beneficiaries of the period's intersubjective valuation of secrecy, they

are not principally responsible for establishing a theoretical defense of secretive practices; that role belongs to Thomas Carlyle, whose complex metaphysics of heroic signification, first fully articulated in *Sartor Resartus* (1833–34), offers one of Victorian England's strongest arguments for embracing the aesthetic and spiritual value of secrecy. The majority of this chapter is devoted, therefore, to an extended close reading of *Sartor Resartus* that traces the subtle nuances and hyperbolic expressions of Carlyle's theory of heroic signification and its contribution to the Victorians' dialectical attitude towards secrecy. The chapter concludes by connecting Carlyle's theory of signification in *Sartor* with his more overtly political version of heroism and hero-worship in his later work. The ease with which Carlyle adapts his early radical aesthetics to his later reactionary politics leads me to reconsider the Victorian democratic theorists discussed in the Introduction in light of the issue of apparently extra-political authority raised by Carlyle and the Freemasons. I contend that, despite their ostensible support for some version of democracy, these theorists and the Liberal English culture that produced them retained a degree of authoritarianism that was uncomfortably similar to Carlyle's, and that this predilection for select forms of authority helps to explain why the century's many organized calls for radical social and political equality met with accusations that they were products of a secret conspiracy.

I. Figuring F/freemasonry

It is not difficult to find either incidental allusions or more in-depth references to the figure of Freemasonry in a wide range of Victorian writing.[3] In fact, such prominent nineteenth-century novelists as George Eliot, Charles Dickens and William Makepeace Thackeray all make opportunistic use of the Masons' publicity. These three authors deploy the figure of Freemasonry with a healthy dose of irony, even as they allow for the aesthetic attractiveness Freemasonry might generate by virtue of its connections to the practice of art, the profession of law and the mysterious inner workings of "the great world."[4] Thomas De Quincey manifests a similar dialectical relationship to the figure of Freemasonry in his two non-fiction prose essays, "Historico-Critical Inquiry Into the Origin of the Rosicrucians and Free-Masons" and "Secret Societies." Both cast doubt on the Masons' public respectability, "Historico-Critical Inquiry" by debunking their pretensions to pre-seventeenth-century origins, and "Secret Societies" by lightheartedly arguing that "The great and illustrious humbug of Modern History—of the History which boasts a present and a future, as well as a past—is FREEMASONRY" (191). At the same time, however, De Quincey does admit to a certain intersubjective sympathy for Freemasonry, especially in "Secret Societies," where in the midst of his playful depiction of a Masonic initiation rite as

an elaborate excuse to drink he declines to reveal what he knows of the actual rituals of membership because doing so would violate his own oath of secrecy. These authors' acceptance of Masonic secrecy hinges on the connection between the Masons and the elite public, reflected both in the professional and high-society associations made by the novelists and by De Quincey's appeal to the period's valuation of integrity through his unwillingness to violate his oath.

Finally, Dr. Thomas Arnold, headmaster of Rugby School, adds an aura of respectability and social authority to the figure of Freemasonry in his private correspondence on the topic. Arnold's yearning for "a sort of masonry" has already been documented by Adams in *Dandies and Desert Saints* and has been related to various conceptions of Victorian manliness,[5] but Arnold's thoughts on the subject deserve a second look in the context of the more public references to Freemasonry outlined above. Written five years apart, Arnold's two recorded comments on the Masons reveal his deeply conflicting feelings towards them and the broader practices of secrecy they had come to represent. On the one hand, Arnold appears thoroughly opposed to the Freemasons themselves. Writing to Reverend Trevenen Penrose (10 April 1841), he declaims, "The half-heathen clubs, including, above all, Freemasonry, are, I think, utterly unlawful for a Christian man: they are close brotherhoods, formed with those who are not in a close sense our brethren" (Stanley, *Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold,* 2: 230). It is difficult to pinpoint what exactly Arnold objects to, whether it is Freemasonry's ecumenicism, although English Freemasonry was almost entirely Anglican, or the ways in which the society's commitment to equality prompts improper connections across class lines, although again most English Masons were members of the middle and upper classes. In either case, it seems evident that Arnold finds them wanting according to public middle-class notions of propriety; however, one should also note that, in this letter at least, Arnold does not overtly oppose Masonic secrecy.

In fact, in an earlier letter to Sir Thomas S. Pasley (11 May 1836), Arnold seems friendly to what we might call freemasonry divorced from the Freemasons. His comments, though lengthy, are worth quoting in full because they help to dramatize the ways in which one might authorize one's own exercise of secrecy by appealing to a discourse of interiority:

> I meet with a great many persons in the course of the year, and with many whom I admire and like; but what I feel daily more and more to need, as life every year rises before me in its true reality, is to have intercourse with those who take life in earnest. It is very painful to me to be always on the surface of things; and I think that literature, science, politics—many topics of far greater interest than mere gossip or talking about the weather—are yet, as they are generally talked about, still on the surface; they do not touch the real depths of life. It is not that I want much

> of what is called religious conversation,—that, I believe, is often on the surface, like other conversation; but I want a sign, which one catches as by a sort of masonry, that a man knows what he is about in life,—whither tending and in what cause engaged; and when I find this, it seems to open my heart as thoroughly, and with as fresh a sympathy, as when I was twenty years younger. (Stanley, *Correspondence,* 2: 42)

Arnold begins by asserting that he feels he is acquiring an increasingly complete access to Truth, or life "in its true reality." This information encourages him to establish a binary opposition between "the surface of things," or those things that most people ordinarily talk about and the manner in which they talk about them, and "the depths of life," in which life "in its true reality" resides. Since this binary division clearly privileges "the depths of life," it seems implicit that the division between surfaces and depths is itself one of the facets of "true reality." If everyone could see the difference between the two types of conversation, all would choose to operate on a deeper level rather than merely at the surface. The perception of surfaces and depths, then, becomes a sort of initiating mechanism into the fraternity of earnest like-minded men with whom Arnold would like to have dialogue. Most of the time, these men would interact with others on the surface-level of middle-class virtues, concealing their knowledge of life's true reality, its secret of interiority, until another of similar perception gave them a sign, "which one catches as by a sort of masonry," and which would signal to all those qualified by their earnestness and superior knowledge that a more meaningful discussion of life's depths, of Truth, could begin. Presumably, such a depth-level discussion could even take place in mixed company, since only the initiate would know that it had begun and could thus conduct it "beneath the surface" of ordinary conversation. For Arnold, these depth-level discussions, initiated by a secret sign, and dedicated to the unearthing of Truth, would be not only meaningful, but distinctly pleasurable, even intimate. Arnold thus links truth, privilege, and pleasure together under his intersubjective endorsement of a select form of secrecy.

English Freemasons would have made claims similar to Arnold's about their own "sort of masonry." Indeed, Masonic secrecy was justified by the Freemasons' supposed access to sacred truths that they claimed to guard from corruption and potential misuse in the world at large. They did so by a carefully controlled method of recruitment, an internal hierarchy and an elaborate system of allegory and symbol.[6] In order to become a Mason, the prospective applicant had to first find two members willing to sponsor him, a deceptively difficult task since active Masons were sworn to neither reveal their membership nor to recruit new members. After finding his sponsors, the applicant would then have his application reviewed by the officers of the Lodge; upon their approval he would undergo an elaborate initiation ceremony,

during which he would be partially disrobed, blindfolded, placed at sword-point, and made to swear that he would keep the secrets of the Lodge or suffer horrible, though probably figurative, penalties. Only then, with the force of secrecy already impressed upon him, would the new Mason be initiated into the elementary secrets of the Masonic step, handclasp and password. The acquisition of more esoteric and significant truths would have to wait until the Entered Apprentice had attained more advanced degrees and titles within the Masonic hierarchy, which in English United Grand Lodge Freemasonry was composed of over thirty distinct positions.[7] Masonic historian A. E. Waite explains that in thus subdividing themselves, English Freemasons ensured that "there are always Mysteries behind the Mysteries and a more withdrawn adytum behind the Holy of Holies" (2: 208).

These "Mysteries behind the Mysteries" were kept veiled by a complex range of symbols, the most prominent of which were a builder's square interlaced with two compasses, the architecture of the Lodge itself, and the Masonic apron. The precise meanings of these items in Victorian English Masonry is difficult to fully recover today. However, in 1922 Master Mason W. L. Wilmhurst published his *The Meaning of Masonry* in an attempt to revive Masonic traditions he felt were disappearing, and his conservative account of Freemasonry's more esoteric side gives an adequate idea of the symbolic significance these items possessed. According to Wilmhurst, the compass and square design most readily associated with the Masons represents the triadic human soul, which combines within itself the divine Word, the passive reception of that word and the active embodiment of its principles. The architecture of the Lodge is a bit more complex, but is founded on the belief that "the four sides of the Lodge point to four different, yet progressive, modes of consciousness available to us. Sense-impression (North), reason (West), intellectual ideation (South), and spiritual intuition (East); making up our four ways of knowledge" (93). These points of the compass take on special significance during rites of initiation and promotion, with the principle officers of the Lodge occupying strategic positions reflecting their role in the ceremony—the Chief Officer, for example, stands in the East, the most privileged direction, reflecting his high degree of knowledge—and candidates progress from the west end to the northeast corner to the southeast corner to the center of the room as they advance in degrees. During this progression from Entered Apprentice to Master Mason, the candidates' aprons also undergo a number of symbolic transformations. According to Wilmhurst, the apron represents "our body of mortality . . . the real 'badge of innocence,' the common 'bond of friendship,' with which the Great Architect has been pleased to invest us all" (31), with its triangular top and square bottom signifying the spiritual and physical sides of that body respectively. When a Mason progresses from Entered Apprentice to Fellow-Craft, the triangular section is folded down onto the square section, symbolizing the union of these

two sides, and the apron is decorated with pale blue rosettes, indicating the first blossoming of his true nature. Wilmhurst becomes almost enraptured when describing the installation of a Master Mason, whose apron, he says,

> is garnished with a light blue border and rosettes, indicating that a higher than the natural light now permeates his being and radiates from his person, and that the wilderness of the natural man is now blossoming as the rose, in the flowers and graces incident to his regenerate nature; whilst upon either side of the apron are seen two columns of light descending from above, streaming into the depths of his whole being, and terminating in the seven-fold tassels which typify the seven-fold prismatic spectrum of the supernal Light. . . . [H]e also wears the triple *Tau,* which comprises the form of a level, but is also the Hebrew form of the Cross. (45–46)

It is doubtful whether every Fellow of the Craft in Victorian England would have seen his installation in quite this way, but the important thing to note is that the sense of Wilmhurst's almost mystical account bears a remarkable semblance to Arnold's admission that meeting a like-minded man with whom to plumb the depths of Truth opens his heart with fresh sympathy and pleasure. In other words, Arnold's yearning for a "sort of masonry" may have been precisely the feeling that led many Victorian men to actual Masonry, which combined a claim to spiritual Truth with a feeling of privileged belonging and, in the case of Wilmhurst, an obvious aesthetic pleasure.

In addition to their multivalent appeal to a standard of interior value, the Masons also offered prospective members an institutional history that lent political value to their practices of secrecy. After being officially recognized in the Unlawful Societies Act, English Masons embarked upon a period of consolidation and expansion that continued largely unabated for the rest of the century. The fifty years prior to the Act had been ones of internal division, with Freemasonry in England divided into the Antient and Modern factions.[8] These two groups were brought together in 1813 by their mutual agreement to the 21 Articles of Union and the formation of the United Grand Lodge of England. This centralization and normalization of Freemasonry then allowed for the society's rapid expansion throughout the burgeoning British Empire. Grand Lodges had already been founded in Ireland (1717), Scotland (1729), and a handful of British colonies at this time; they were joined after unification by Grand Lodges in Bengal (1813), Malta (1815), Brazil (1821), Bombay (1843), Canada (1857), Nigeria (1867), New South Wales (1888), New Zealand (1890), and Tasmania (1890), not to mention the numerous lodges of English origin in Europe and the United States. In sum, English Freemasonry and British colonialism went hand-in-hand, increasing the financial and cultural influence of England throughout the world. As a result, Freemasonry

came to be seen as a distinctly "English" organization whose secretive practices could be legitimately differentiated from those of less acceptable secret societies by virtue of their complicity within Britain's global empire.

This process of expansion took place under the leadership of a number of socially prominent men whose connection to English Freemasonry increased its public acceptance. Freemasonry's ranks had long been composed almost exclusively of the wealthy middle classes, but its leaders, beginning with the fourth Grand Master, the Duke of Montague (1721), have often been members of the landed nobility. In the nineteenth century, Freemasonry counted among its leaders George, Prince of Wales (1805; later George IV), The Duke of Sussex (1813), the Earl of Zetland (1843), Earl de Gray and Ripon (1870), and Edward, Prince of Wales (1875; later Edward VII). Even Queen Victoria's father, the Duke of Kent, had been elected the leader of the Antients in 1813; it was he who nominated the Duke of Sussex as the first Grand Master of the United Grand Lodge. In a period that placed significant stress on social deference and aristocratic rank, these leaders gave English Freemasonry enormous prestige and public endorsement; how could one question whether or not the society was acceptable when it was being led by some of the same men who governed the nation?

The final historical reason for Freemasonry's acceptance in England was provided almost independently of the Masons themselves by the Roman Catholic Church. Since 1738, when Pope Clement XII issued the Bull *In Eminenti,* Masonry was publicly condemned by a long succession of Popes. *In Eminenti* was renewed by Pius VII in 1814, and was followed by two similar Papal Bulls in 1825 and 1884, as well as by anti-Masonic Papal Allocutions or Encyclicals in 1821, 1829, 1832, 1846, 1849, and 1856. Given the long tradition of English anti-Catholicism, such an adversarial relation to Rome was an asset in the minds of many Englishmen. Rome's animosity provided a public religious reason to go along with the private spiritual, aesthetic, intersubjective, imperial and deferential reasons for granting English Freemasons' institutional secrecy an exceptional degree of social acceptance. That this acceptance was forthcoming at all also shows that secrecy could be valued so long as it was connected to the correct mix of social strata and nationalist ideology.

II. Carlyle's Clothes Philosophy

Although the Masons serve as the most prominent practical example of the ways in which public distrust of secretive behavior could be dialectically mollified by appeals to the attractiveness of secrecy, they do not provide the most theoretically sophisticated rationale for how practices of secrecy might enhance one's own extra-

political authority. In *Sartor Resartus,* Thomas Carlyle proposes just such a theory of authorized secrecy. Carlyle's championing of the heroic status of society's "tailors" is grounded on a metaphysics of signification that centrally relies on the practice of secrecy. In fact, secrecy and silence become the hallmarks of spiritual and aesthetic authority in *Sartor,* which offers itself to the reader as a kind of justification-by-example for the value of these attributes.

Significantly, Carlyle presents his idiosyncratic defense of secrecy even as he makes a peculiar contribution to the field of allusive references to English Freemasonry.[9] The most explicit allusion to the Masons in *Sartor* appears in book two, where Teufelsdröckh lists, among "the everstreaming currents of Sights, Hearings, Feelings for Pain or Pleasure, whereby, as in a Magic Hall, young Gneschen [himself] went about environed" (II.2.73), a family of swallows for whom his father had provided a nesting location:

> The hospitable Father (for cleanliness' sake) had fixed a little bracket, plumb under their nest: there they built, and caught flies, and twittered, and bred; and all, I chiefly, from the heart loved them. Bright nimble creatures, who taught *you* the mason-craft; nay, stranger still, gave you a masonic incorporation, almost social police? For if, by ill chance, and when time pressed, your house fell, have I not seen five neighborly Helpers appear next day; and swashing to and fro, with animated, loud, long-drawn chirpings, and activity almost super-hirundine, complete it again before nightfall? (II.2.74)

Interestingly, Teufelsdröckh's swallows lack two crucial masonic attributes, secrecy and authority: these "bright nimble creatures" keep nothing hidden from the "young Gneschen," nesting openly at the sufferance of Teufelsdröckh's father. Such a lack of freemasonry in this allusion to the Masons is an important rhetorical move since it preemptorally eliminates any Masonic connotations from his later linkage of secrecy, heroism and authority, thereby allowing Carlyle to attach his own meanings to these terms.

The sense of this bizarrely non-Masonic allusion to Freemasonry is difficult to discern at the moment it appears, however, because of Teufelsdröckh's ironic stance towards his own remembrance. As the English Editor notes, "it remains ever doubtful whether he is laughing in his sleeve at the Autobiographical times of ours, or writing from the abundance of his own fond ineptitude" (I.2.73). This central doubt about whether or not Teufelsdröckh should be taken seriously, and the Editor's unflagging insistence that the reader should be made continuously aware of this doubt, led to a great deal of confusion, if not outright condemnation, among the first readers of *Sartor Resartus.* American reviews were generally less vituperative than their British counterparts, but

even they did not know what to make of the book.[10] An article in the *Southern Literary Journal,* for example, judged, "In this work with a singular name, and based on such a singular fiction, there is, nevertheless, much deep thought, much eloquence of expression, much high feeling, much even of exalted religious conception" ("Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus,*" 1). However, this judgment should be tempered by the fact that the article spends the majority of its time using *Sartor Resartus* as a platform from which to launch proposals for proper university instruction, with the result that the actual philosophy of clothes goes almost unmentioned in the review. A similarly incomplete article in the *North American Review* seemed largely content to prove the factual basis of *Sartor Resartus* "a hum" and to conclude rather vaguely that the text "contains, under a quaint and singular form, a great deal of deep thought, sound principle, and fine writing" ([Everett], "Thomas Carlyle," 456, 481). In contrast to these two reviews, which hide their own confusion behind platitudinous praise, Joseph H. Barrett's article in the *American Whig Review* attacked Carlyle's apparent impenetrability, dismissing Teufelsdröckh's philosophy of clothes as "the purest abstraction" (128), "cant" (130), and even as evidence of "mental disease" (131), and noting throughout the book "an inexcusable, if not, as would sometimes appear, an intentional ambiguity" (133).

For the purposes of this study, however, the most insightful expression of confusion came from an anonymous notice in *Tait's Edinburgh Review,* which wondered "By what fatality was it that the most radically Radical speculation upon men and things, which has appeared for many years, should have first come abroad in a violent Tory periodical?" (*Tait's* 611). By applying the labels "Radical" and "Tory" to Carlyle's text, *Tait's* places *Sartor Resartus* squarely within the political realm and suggests that it may have a certain amount of relevance to the nineteenth century's debate over democracy. What the text's relationship to that debate might be is difficult to determine, though, since *Sartor* largely avoids explicitly political language in favor of a discourse of aesthetic and spiritual authority. This rhetorical shift to an alternative standard of interior value has significant, if tacit, political implications, however, especially when considered in light of Carlyle's later work. In other words, even though *Sartor* is in many ways "the most radically Radical speculation upon men and things, which has appeared in many years," its politics are ultimately well-suited for "a violent Tory periodical."[11]

One can see Carlyle echo the Masons in his attempt to shift his readers' standards of value from the political to the aesthetic when a single passage, Teufelsdröckh's disquisition on Emblems, is subjected to close inspection. Since this paragraph succinctly captures a significant portion of the argument and the rhetoric of Teufelsdröckh's philosophy of clothes, it can serve as a sufficiently representative example of both the content and the style of *Sartor Resartus* as a whole.[12] The passage on Emblems is as follows:

> All visible things are Emblems; what thou seest is not there on its own account; strictly taken, is not there at all: Matter exists only spiritually, and to represent some Idea, and *body* it forth. Hence Clothes, as despicable as we think them, are so unspeakably significant. Clothes, from the King's mantle downwards, are Emblematic, not of want only, but of a manifold cunning Victory over Want. On the other hand, all Emblematic things are properly Clothes, thought-woven or hand-woven: must not Imagination weave Garments, visible Bodies, wherein the else invisible creations and inspirations of our Reason are, like Spirits, revealed, and first become all powerful;—the rather if, as we often see, the Hand too aid her, and (by wool Clothes or otherwise) reveal such even to the outward eye? (I.11.55–56)

This paragraph neatly turns what could be taken as a highly charged political comment on the monarchy—the almost casual example of "the King's mantle"—into a radical aesthetic reflection on the making of meaning.[13] "Matter," according to Teufelsdröckh, does not exist except as a physical manifestation of an already extant "Idea" that fills it with meaning. This obvious act of homage to "learned, indefatigable, deep-thinking Germany" effectively undercuts the authority invested in appearance, politics and the material realm by the Scottish Common Sense school and the then-dominant Utilitarianism of Bentham and Mill and replaces it with an authority grounded in an aesthetic discourse of interiority.[14]

In the second half of the paragraph, Teufelsdröckh adds a spiritual dimension to his argument as well. These last few sentences preserve the idea that all meaning is constructed through visible emblems even as they identify the agency behind this construction in increasingly sacred terms. The impersonal attributes of Imagination and Reason turn out to be the weavers of society's Clothes, and even these intellectual categories do not act alone. They, too, are directed by "else invisible creations and inspirations" to reveal meanings that, "like Spirits," are already there. The religious overtones of this formulation are difficult to ignore, and their presence subtly shifts the original political register implied by "the King's mantle" into more spiritual terms by theorizing that all Emblems come from a higher authority to which the only proper response is "the reverential wonder inspired by the immeasurable and the incomprehensible" (Deen 439). At the level of content, then, Teufelsdröckh's paragraph on Emblems at once enacts a move from political to aesthetic/spiritual standards of value and offers the beginnings of an implicit justification of authorized secrecy: if this secrecy can legitimately claim superior Imagination, Reason, and/or divine inspiration, then accepting it is the highest form of consistency for a faithful people.

At the level of form, this paragraph further reinforces Teufelsdröckh's appeal to

an interior standard of value. For example, the text rewards those readers willing to look beyond its surface with a good laugh. As G. B. Tennyson rather boldly states, "He who has never laughed at *Sartor* has missed a substantial part of its appeal" (273), an appeal most obviously manifested by the somewhat blasphemous English translation of Diogenes Teufelsdröckh's own name as "God-born devil's dung." [15] More serious rewards appear to beckon these same readers if they are willing to contend with the paragraph's formal obscurity—its opaque declarations, fragmentary clauses, unfamiliar patterns of capitalization and unusual syntax.[16] However, I would agree with G. B. Tennyson that the emblems passage is less concerned with rewarding readers than it is with securing a kind of textual authority for Teufelsdröckh, and by extension for Carlyle, through deliberate rhetorical obfuscation. Referring specifically to this passage, Tennyson writes, "Carlyle's kind of statement grasps and entwines, and we struggle as the fly in marmalade" (246).[17] This simile is particularly apt since, on a first reading, the paragraph seductively appears to have all of the elements of a logically balanced argument: it begins with a short proposition, which is subsequently expanded upon in a series of curt clauses; the next sentence progresses onward with "Hence"; an "On the other hand" two sentences later signals the end of the first part of the argument and the beginning of an alternative; these two sides are then logically reconciled after the final dash and this synthetic position stated in the form of a question that invites readerly activity.

Those readers who take up Teufelsdröckh's invitation and pause for a closer look, however, are sucked into a rhetoric so thick that they may never get free.[18] What, for example, are the relations between the four clauses in sentence one, and how does this relation logically permit the substitution of "Matter" for "all visible things," not to mention the blatant contradiction that this Matter is simultaneously "not there at all" and able to "represent some idea and *body* it forth"? Also, "Hence" implies that a sort of proof has taken place, but what is the exact nature of this proof? Similarly, where is "the one hand" that balances out "the other hand" of sentence four? Finally, although the terminal question is rhetorical, and therefore interested in prompting passive agreement from the thoroughly stuck reader, what, other than its impressive and somnambulistic length, would prevent a negative answer? The fact that the paragraph has been prefaced by the English Editor's amused question only adds to its power of persuasion, since, by chummily preparing the British Reader for more airy sailing, the Editor's comments encourage him to pardon Teufelsdröckh any obscurity and to "study and enjoy, in simplicity of heart, what is here presented him, and with whatever metaphysical acumen, and talent for Meditation he is possessed of" (I.2.10).[19]

In one of the most theoretically supple and compelling articles written on *Sartor* in recent years, "'Devising New Means': *Sartor Resartus* and the Devoted Reader," Vivienne Rundle begins to show how Carlyle's careful use of rhetorical obscurity,

or textual secrecy, serves to elevate Carlyle to a position of aesthetic and spiritual authority over the reader. Bringing together theoretical work by Derrida, Lacan, and, implicitly, Barthes, she investigates the readerly role that emerges from the unconventional structure of Carlyle's text. Rundle begins by asserting that the contemporary negative reaction to *Sartor Resartus* "derives in fact from the text's action upon its reader: an action that oversteps the bounds of the conventional contract between text and reader in ways which may be considered unfair, underhanded or even unethical" (13). This unethical treatment consists primarily of "forcing the reader to abandon conventional notions of narrative structure and authority" in order to incite "a readerly revolution" (14). Unlike the solely radical revolution implied by Brian Cowlishaw and other critics, however, Rundle's "readerly revolution" is far less liberating because it relies on a bivalent definition of revolution as both upheaval and stasis. Like Cowlishaw, she argues that Carlyle's difficult style goads a reader into activity; however, for Rundle this activity takes the form of an endless circling around a "truth of the text" that, if it exists at all, is never revealed. Instead the various narrative voices all adopt "the persona of the ultimate subject-presumed-to-know, alternately flaunting his presumed knowledge and withholding it from the frustrated and subjugated reader" (20). Connecting this explicitly to practices of secrecy and their role in structures of authority, Rundle continues, "both Teufelsdröckh and the Editor finally refuse to divulge their secret knowledge: to do so would necessitate the surrender of the only authority they possess. For all the figures of textual authority in *Sartor Resartus,* mystery—which involves submission to a truth beyond human reason—is a necessary element of mastery" (20). In Rundle's sophisticated argument, then, Carlyle assumes a position of extra-political authority over the reader by means of a textual freemasonry of his own.

In order to fully understand how Carlyle's appeals to aesthetic and spiritual authority centrally rely on his own practice of secrecy, one must turn from Teufelsdröckh's single paragraph on Emblems to his larger Philosophy of Clothes. At the heart of this extended theory of signification is the English Editor's cunningly "practical" arrangement of Teufelsdröckh's "speculations on *Symbols*" (III.3.161).[20] Curiously, these speculations do not begin with symbols at all, but with the larger topic of Concealment:

> "The benignant efficacies of Concealment," cries our Professor, "who shall speak or sing? SILENCE and SECRECY! Altars might still be raised to them (were this an altar-building time) for universal worship. Silence is the element in which great things fashion themselves together; that at length they may emerge, full-formed and majestic, into the daylight of Life, which they are thenceforth to rule." (III.3.161)

Here is De Quincey's praise of the sublimity of secret societies written over fifteen years earlier.[21] Carlyle's version contains two intriguing extra elements, however:

rulership, and, implicitly, virtue. This tacit connection of secrecy and virtue is reinforced by Teufelsdröckh's allusion to the Gospel of Matthew 6:3 in the next paragraph: "Thought will not work except in Silence: neither will Virtue work except in Secrecy. Let not thy right hand know what thy left hand doeth!" (III.3.162). Like the Freemasons, Teufelsdröckh insinuates that secrecy, insofar as it derives from a privileged access to Truth, is a perfectly legitimate, even a praiseworthy, practice.[22]

It is only after this initial panegyric on concealment and secrecy that the chapter turns to "the wondrous agency of *Symbols*" (III.3.162). Teufelsdröckh divides symbols into two categories, the extrinsically valuable and the intrinsically valuable. Symbols of the first category appeal to humanity's "shallow superficial faculties . . . Self-love and Arithmetical Understanding" and tend to last only so long as those "accidental Standards of multitudes" that originally produced them (III.3.166, 164). Although within an extrinsically valuable symbol "there glimmers something of a Divine Idea" (III.3.164), this Idea is warped by the historical contingency of its symbol and therefore is likely to be unrecognized or at least imperfectly actualized before the symbol becomes obsolete. Teufelsdröckh gives as his first two examples of extrinsically valuable symbols "'that clouted Shoe which the Peasants bore aloft with them as ensign in their *Bauernkrieg* (Peasants' War)'" and "'the Wallet-and-staff round which the Netherland *Gueux,* glorying in that nickname of Beggars, heroically rallied and prevailed, though against King Philip himself'" (III.3.164). Though not without a plebeian sort of power, then, extrinsically valuable symbols retain their authority for a very short time. By contrast, intrinsically valuable symbols last far longer. Building on humanity's "'deep infinite faculties . . . Fantasy and Heart'" (III.3.168), this second category of symbols manifests more than just a glimmer of the "Godlike." In fact, intrinsically valuable symbols show "Eternity looking through Time" (III.3.165). Among these symbols of "the Godlike rendered visible" are "all true Works of Art" and those religions in which "all men can recognize a present God" (III.3.165). As the supreme example of an intrinsically valuable symbol, Teufelsdröckh cites "Jesus of Nazareth, and his Life, and his Biography, and what followed therefrom" (III.3.165).

However, since "Jesus of Nazareth, and his Life, and his Biography" can only be known indirectly through contextually dependent translations of the Gospels, this final example begins to break down the firm distinction between historically contingent extrinsic symbols and eternally viable intrinsic symbols. This collapse of categories is hinted at by Teufelsdröckh himself, who admits that Christianity's "significance will ever demand to be anew inquired into, and anew made manifest" (III.3.165). Even the most enduring symbol of Christianity, the Cross, originally "had no meaning saving an accidental extrinsic one" (III.3.164), and so cannot escape the process of resignification and the burden of historical contingency. For Teufelsdröckh the idea of the Divine itself remains unchanged and unchangeable, but the manifestations of this sacred

realm are always subject to their historical contexts. As Catherine Gallagher succinctly observes, this contingency means that "symbols, like all other representations, have a partially oppositional relationship to the content they signify" and are therefore "at least partially socially determined, arbitrary and potentially ironic" (195, 196). This potential irony, or the gap between the sacred realm and its manifestation in a particular symbol, connects symbols to Teufelsdröckh's earlier comments on concealment and secrecy. It turns out that "In a Symbol there is concealment and yet revelation: here, therefore, by Silence and by Speech acting together, comes a doubled significance. And if both the Speech be itself high, and the Silence fit and noble, how expressive will their union be!" (III.3.162). In other words, in the right hands performative extra-political secrecy itself may be as close to an intrinsically valuable symbol as one can get, since by thus making secrecy a figure one simultaneously speaks, "I have a secret," and remains silent about that secret's aesthetic and/or spiritual contents, thereby protecting it from historical contingency.

Since it is "'in and through *Symbols* that man, consciously or unconsciously, lives, works, and has his being'" (III.3.164), the question of authorized secrecy—of who can legitimately practice secrecy and who cannot—becomes increasingly important. In other words, who is qualified to ensure that practices of secrecy preserve virtuous rulership? In a gesture towards Carlyle's later work, Teufelsdröckh responds that this is the task of the hero. Among his examples of intrinsically valuable symbols he includes "'the Lives of heroic, god-inspired Men'" (III.3.165), a theme also taken up later in the chapter.[23] After declaring that all symbols fade with time, Teufelsdröckh prophesies the need for new symbols and for heroic poet-prophets to craft them: "'A Hierarch, therefore, and Pontiff of the World will we call him, the Poet and inspired Maker; who, Prometheus-like, can shape new Symbols, and bring new Fire from Heaven to fix it there. Such too will not always be wanting: neither perhaps now are'" (III.3.166). The final clause of this exhortation suggests that these heroic makers and guardians of the transcendentally symbolic are already in the world, though perhaps unrecognized by most people.

In order to help his readers to detect these heroes already in their midst, Teufelsdröckh presents three groups with a sufficient connection to Clothes to lay claim to heroic status. The first two of these groups, Dandies and Poor-Slaves, are represented as falsely heroic secret societies in "The Dandiacal Body." "A Dandy," the English Editor explains, "is a Clothes-wearing Man, a Man whose trade, office and existence consists in the wearing of Clothes" (III.10.200). Teufelsdröckh waxes more metaphorical when he describes the Dandy as a member of a quasi-religious "Sect" composed of "moon-calves and monstrosities" and dedicated to "that primeval Superstition, *Self-Worship*" (III.10.202). Striving "to maintain a true Nazarene deportment," these self-worshippers gather in the Temple of "*Almack's,*" where they read sacred "*Fashionable*

Novels" and practice rites which, though "by some supposed to be of the Menadic sort, or perhaps with an Eleusian or Cabiric character, are held strictly secret" (III.10.203). Teufelsdröckh purports to expose "the true secret, the Religious physiognomy and physiology of the Dandiacal Body" by outlining the "Seven distinct Articles" of the Dandies' creed as follows:

1. Coats should have nothing of the triangle about them; at the same time, wrinkles should be carefully avoided.
2. The collar is a very important point: it should be low behind, and slightly rolled.
3. No licence of fashion can allow a man of delicate taste to adopt the posterial luxuriance of a Hottentot.
4. There is safety in a swallow-tail.
5. The good sense of a gentleman is nowhere more finely developed than in his rings.
6. It is permitted to mankind, under certain restrictions, to wear white waistcoats.
7. The trowsers must be exceedingly tight across the hips. (III.10.204–05)

As these Articles of Faith make clear, although the Dandy does have an intimate connection with Clothes and strives to project a dignified mien, his self-absorption and willfully extrinsic values make him utterly unsuited to be a heroic and god-inspired man. Likewise, his "Sect," with all of its secretive practices, is an unacceptable secret society because, even though it does maintain privilege and doubtless produce pleasure for its members, it does not have a legitimate claim to transcendental Truth.

Like their counterparts, the Dandies, the Poor-Slaves also fall short of heroic status. Chiefly composed of the Irish poor, though rapidly spreading throughout the British Isles, this alternative Sect has a bivalent connection to Clothes. On the one hand, "they appear to imitate the Dandiacal Sect in their grand principle of wearing a peculiar Costume," which consists of "innumerable skirts, lappets, and irregular wings, of all cloths and of all colours; through the labyrinthic intricacies of which their bodies are introduced by some unknown process" (III.10.206). On the other hand, though Teufelsdröckh never says so directly, his description of the Poor-Slaves, also known as the Drudge Sect, implicitly includes the poorest of clothes-makers, British textile workers. Rather than being understood as narcissistic Self-Worshippers, Poor Slaves might be better fancied "worshippers of Hertha, or the Earth: for they dig and affectionately work continually in her bosom; or else, shut up in private Oratories, meditate and manipulate the substances derived from her" (III.10.206). Teufelsdröckh confesses his ignorance of any common Articles of Faith

among the Poor-Slaves, saying that his lack of information can be attributed to their lack of "Canonical Books" (III.10.205). However, the fact that he includes among their ranks "*Ribbonmen,*" "*Peep-of-day-Boys,*" "*Babes of the Wood*" and "*Rockites*" (III.10.205), and predicts that they will one day also absorb "Radicals" (III.10.209), implies that, if they did exist, these Articles would be politically radical, distinctly lower class, and potentially unlawful. In other words, the Poor-Slaves are too extrinsic, in terms of both ideology and class, to be either true heroes or members of an acceptable secret society.

Standing in contrast to both of these falsely heroic Sects are tailors. "'The Tailor,'" says Teufelsdröckh, "'is not only a Man, but something of a Creator or Divinity'" (III.11.212), and this connection to intrinsic Truth makes him the only legitimate maker, mender and guardian of society's Clothes. Preeminent among Tailors are the poets, about whom Teufelsdröckh quotes Goethe as saying "'Nay, if thou wilt have it, who but the Poet first made Gods for men; brought them down to us; and raised us up to them?'" (III.11.212). The world, Teufelsdröckh triumphantly predicts, "will recognize that the Tailor is its Hierophant, and Hierarch, or even its God" (III.11.213). As the title of Carlyle's text, *Sartor Resartus* (The Tailor Retailored), makes clear, Teufelsdröckh is himself the primary example of a "Metaphorical Tailor," or poet-prophet. His grounding in German metaphysics connects him with a transcendental realm of intrinsic value that he manifests, or clothes, in his *Die Kleider ihr Werden und Wirken* (Clothes, their Origin and Influence). Teufelsdröckh's connection with Divine Truth and his position of social privilege are simultaneously reflected by

> the Professor's private domicile. It was the attic floor of the highest house in the Wahngasse; and might truly be called the pinnacle of Weissnichtwo, for it rose sheer up above the contiguous roofs, themselves rising from elevated ground. . . . So that it was in fact the speculum or watch-tower of Teufelsdröckh; wherefrom, sitting at ease, he might see the whole life-circulation of that considerable City; the streets and lanes of which, with all their doing and driving (*Thun und Trieben*) were for most part visible there. (I.3.16).

This ability to see and subtly direct the world while sitting at ease outside of its doing and driving is precisely the point of the text's endorsement of the heroic. Only when secreted in his celestial apartment can Teufelsdröckh access the intrinsically symbolic and establish his own aesthetic and spiritual authority by writing *Die Kleider.*

When coupled with his earlier comments on Symbols, Teufelsdröckh's final location of the divine in the heroic offers an answer to the question of authorized secrecy with important political implications. Much like Teufelsdröckh's attic room in Weissnichtwo,

heroism provides a moral and spiritual high ground that remains above the level of logic, where political problems can be solved by an appeal to "intrinsic value" and proximity to a realm of divinity whose authority is absolute. From this vantage point above the extrinsic chaos of everyday life, one can remain unperturbed by pressures for social change, since, as Vanden Bossche lucidly notes, "The clothing metaphor . . . represents the fundamental historicity of cultural institutions and the inevitability of periodic revolution. Since nothing can prevent the processes of decay that destroy old clothing, *Sartor*'s pervasive organic imagery suggests that revolution and historical change are natural, noncataclysmic processes" (*Carlyle and the Search for Authority,* 43). Once accepted, the necessity of organic change can actually forestall potentially disastrous revolutions, like the French Revolution, by allowing them to be guided, or guarded, by poet-prophets and other heroes. These heroes enjoy a privileged connection with super-social values that most people, especially those of the extrinsically laboring classes, simply cannot perceive, and so not only is their authoritative role divinely sanctioned, it is also effectively kept secret.

This divine naturalization of the aesthetically and spiritually authorized secrecy of the hero in *Sartor Resartus* thus provides an argument for accepting some forms of secrecy while condemning others. However, this argument hinges on Teufelsdröckh, author of *Die Klieder* and proponent of the doctrine of heroism, being a true hero himself. If he is not a hero and therefore does not have privileged access to a realm of intrinsic values, then his whole clothes philosophy becomes simply "the tatters and rags of superannuated worn-out Symbols (in this Ragfair of a World) dropping off every where, to hoodwink, to halter, to tether you; nay if you shake them not aside, threatening to accumulate, and perhaps produce suffocation!" (III.3.166). In fact, the English Editor himself explores this possibility at some length in the text's final chapter, where he identifies three possible reasons for doubting Teufelsdröckh's heroic status: 1) a problem of style: "How could a man occasionally of keen insight, not without keen sense of propriety, who had real Thoughts to communicate, resolve to emit them in a shape bordering so closely on the absurd?" (III.12.215); 2) a problem of intent: "Teufelsdröckh is not without some touch of the universal feeling, a wish to proselytise" (III.12.215); and 3) a problem of commitment: "Professor Teufelsdröckh, be it known, is no longer visibly present at Weissnichtwo, but again to all appearance lost in Space!" (III.12.216). Although the Editor offers little or no response to these potential reasons for doubt—the best he can manage is a vague assertion that Teufelsdröckh is not "made like other men" (III.12.216)—it is the third of these reasons that is perhaps the most damaging. Teufelsdröckh's friend, Hofrath Heuschrecke, in a "copious Epistle," suggests that he might no longer be at Weissnichtwo because he has joined the "*Saint-Simonian Society*" or one of the other revolutionary "Sects that convulse our Era" (III.12.217). In other words,

Teufelsdröckh may have gone against his own theory of interiority and joined a group of extrinsic radicals.

At least one critic, Stephen Franklin, has proposed that whether or not Teufelsdröckh is a hero is unimportant, since the true hero of *Sartor Resartus* is the English Editor. In Franklin's reading, Teufelsdröckh is himself "emblematic of those things incapable of reconstructing themselves and in want of reconstruction" (36). He symbolically arrives in the Editor's hands as the *Die Kleider*—an "enormous, amorphous Plumbpudding, more like a Scottish Haggis" (III.12.214)—and

> Six considerable PAPER-BAGS, carefully sealed, and marked successively, in gilt China-ink, with the symbols of the Six southern Zodiacal Signs, beginning at Libra; in the inside of which sealed Bags, lie miscellaneous masses of Sheets, and oftener Shreds and Snips, written in Professor Teufelsdröckh's scarce-legible *cursiv-schrift;* and treating of all imaginable things under the Zodiac and above it, but of his own personal history only at rare intervals, and then in the most enigmatic manner! (I.11.59)

These the Editor heroically retailors into the meaningful form of *Sartor Resartus* itself, thus indicating that he, not Teufelsdröckh, is the true tailor of the text.

The problem with making the English Editor into the hero is that his connection to the heroic has not been biographically established. As his own painstaking reconstruction of "Teufelsdröckh, his Life and his Biography" indicates, the Editor clearly endorses the text's emphasis on the biographies of "heroic, god-inspired men" as the primary means of accessing the intrinsically symbolic. However, other than periodically deprecating his own fitness for the job, the Editor provides no biographical information about himself, leaving the reader unable to judge whether the Editor's rewriting of Teufelsdröckh's *Die Kleider* is itself intrinsically or extrinsically valuable. This indecision about the transcendental status of *Sartor Resartus* is not helped by the Editor's assurance that he has given a "practical," and therefore implicitly extrinsic, summary of Teufelsdröckh's doctrine of Symbols, leaving the reader to wonder if the extrinsic/intrinsic division is historically contingent and therefore itself extrinsic.

III. Conclusions

Despite its tendency towards solipsism—the hero's practice of secrecy serves as both his warrant of authority and his chief authorized activity—Carlyle's theory of heroic signification retains a prominent place in his later works; this longevity makes perspicuous the tacit political implications of Carlyle's attempts to use the heroic to

secure aesthetic and spiritual authority in *Sartor.* Certainly the progression in *On Heroes, Hero-Worship and the Heroic in History* (1840) from "The Hero as Divinity" through "The Hero as Poet" and "The Hero as Man-of-Letters" to "The Hero as King" suggests that for all his apparent efforts to replace political authority with spiritual and aesthetic authority, Carlyle still seeks to construct a "great man" philosophy of history that favors autocratic monarchs over democratic reformers. In other words, his definition in *On Heroes* of the hero as "he who lives in the inward sphere of things" ultimately lends spiritual and aesthetic authority to political autocrats like Cromwell and Napoleon I (134). Carlyle is much clearer about the specific implications of *Sartor* for contemporary democratic debate in *Past and Present* (1843). Immediately following the assertion of democracy's ubiquity quoted at the beginning of this chapter, Carlyle scathingly defines democracy as closely akin to "Atheism," using as evidence a lengthy quotation from Teufelsdröckh (*Works,* 10: 215–17)!

For Carlyle, then, advocating and demonstrating the aesthetic and spiritual value of secrecy not only grants him an unusual degree of textual authority over his readers, it also supports his political opposition to democracy in favor of political authoritarianism. One can recognize similar authoritarian leanings in the writings of many advocates of limited democratic reform, including Thomas Macaulay, Walter Bagehot, W. R. Greg and J. S. Mill. Such reliance on select forms of authority is most clearly visible in the works of Macaulay and Bagehot, both relatively conservative advocates of the "pro-democracy" position. Macaulay, for example, supports a limited degree of representation for the middle classes in *The History of England,* but argues that expanding the franchise will only upset the delicate balance that guards the general public's interests. Although this position appears marginally democratic, in the sense that everyone is being at least indirectly represented, it is actually devoted to a rigidly stratified definition of equality, in which everyone deserves semi-representational rule but in which only some are ever qualified to be rulers. According to *The History of England,* the monarchy, the aristocracy, the commons, and the people are ideal categories whose relationship to one another is forever fixed according to a definition of Truth that Macaulay locates in the semi-divine Constitution of 1688. Since this document conveniently remains unavailable because it is unwritten, those who may wish to reform these categories can be silenced by Macaulay's authoritative invocation of tradition.

Walter Bagehot provides a similar role for the idealized Constitution of 1688 in his *The English Constitution.* Even more than Macaulay, Bagehot explicitly supports representation for the "lower" orders in the House of Commons. This separation of the lower orders from the "educated ten thousand" who are meant to actually rule the nation appeals to a standard of personal cultivation that was set, maintained, and to a certain extent concealed by those already in power. Authority is most selec-

tively exercised in *The English Constitution* by what Bagehot describes as the "efficient secret" of the cabinet, which derives its power precisely from its practice of authorized secrecy. Bagehot even slyly provides a role for heroes as the "dignified" elements of government whose apparent connection to Truth pacifies the masses into following the dictates of government. In other words, for the lower orders the aristocratic elements of government, the queen and the House of Lords, serve as a spectacle worthy of hero-worship while the true heroes—the cabinet—preserve their connection to the Truth of the Constitution and virtuously rule the nation in secret.

More so than Macaulay and Bagehot, W. R. Greg and J. S. Mill support truly representative institutions for the English people; however, even their advocacy of limited democratic reform linked to education in "Representative Reform" and *Considerations on Representative Government* remains uncomfortably close to an antidemocratic conception of authority. Their causal connection between education and the right to vote implicitly relies on both a static conception of the Truth of, in Mill's words, "individual mental superiority," and a stratified notion of individual equality. Everyone, according to Greg and Mill, deserves to be represented, but only the educated deserve to be fully enfranchised by electing and serving as those representatives. Moreover, these same "educated ten thousand," to borrow an appropriate phrase from Bagehot, also get to set the educational standards required to vote, allowing them to use themselves as the model for citizenship. By requiring others to think like themselves, the already enfranchised members of the "élite" therefore preserve their aristocratic influence over elections by inculcating the masses into their own standard of Truth.

This widespread investment in selective notions of aristocratic authority among even liberal advocates of limited democratic reform explains why a conservative secret society like the Masons could enjoy a high degree of social acceptance even as more radical groups were being publicly condemned by accusations that they employed secretive practices. Domestically, such condemnatory strategies were directed at trade unions and English Catholics, while abroad rebellious colonial subjects were targeted. Ironically, all of these underenfranchised constituencies appealed to the same ideal of equality officially subscribed to by the Masons, and yet their attempts to raise themselves to the status of full citizens were denounced by many who already enjoyed that respectable station because they allegedly relied on institutional secrecy. Such denunciations were made possible by the strategic deployment of the figure of the secret society. In the following chapters I will trace the productive appearance of this figure through several moments of democratic stress in order to demonstrate its important and hitherto neglected place in the larger construction of national identity taking place in Victorian England.

2

Combining the Two Nations: Trade Unions as Secret Societies, 1837–1845

It was not unusual in 1839 in England to find Tories and Whigs, aristocrats and factory owners, MPs and merchants, *Blackwood's* and *The Edinburgh Review,* united in their condemnation of trade unions as conspiratorial secret societies. This consensus of opinion among the relatively privileged owed much to the fact that trade unions, by combining working men together into semi-autonomous bodies, offered a radical challenge to theories of social organization based on practices of middle- and upper-class guardianship. In addition, by binding their members together using ritual forms and oaths, trade unions trespassed on the protected space of the elite public and its exclusive right to fascinating forms of secrecy. Past and present methods of securing union autonomy are aggressively scrutinized in the 1838 House of Commons's *Report of the Select Committee on Combinations,* the results of which achieved national notoriety when they were summarized in *The Annual Register* for that year. This summarized version of the *Report* encourages its readers to respond to the practice of combination according to conventions of respectability and class prejudice, and in so doing reveals some of the characteristic tendencies of the rhetoric surrounding trade unionism in the 1830s and 1840s.

The first of these characteristics appears in comments on secretive organizations generally. According to the *Annual Register, 1838,* trade unions, "Like all secret associations . . . begin by the institution of certain mystic and superstitious rites, which not only impose upon the imagination of their neophytes, but give a dramatic interest to their proceedings, and dignity to their lawless schemes" (204). This generalization that all secret associations are superstitious and lawless tacitly rests on two

premises: 1) that the majority of associations are "open" rather than secret; and 2) that these "open" associations are rational and lawful. Once accepted, these premises create a tautology whereby "secret" and "unlawful" become interchangeable terms; ergo, if trade unions employ secretive practices, then they must be unlawful. That trade unions did employ secretive practices is made clear when the paragraph moves on to describe a mock union initiation ceremony:

> Thus it appears, that the apartments in which their nocturnal conclaves assemble, are often, on occasions of especial solemnity, decorated with battle-axes, drawn swords, skeletons, and other *insignia* of terror. The ceremony of inauguration itself, is said to partake of a religious character. The officials are ranged on either side of the room, in white surplices; on the table is the open bible. The novice is introduced with his eyes bandaged—prayers and hymns are recited—and certain mystic rhymes pronounced; after which an oath is administered, of which the imprecatory form may be easily conceived, and the new member, his eyes being again bandaged, is led out. (204–5)

This example both specifies the more general charges of superstition and lawlessness by introducing the word "terror," and reinforces the connection between this terror and the use of ritual secrecy. At the same time, the tone of this passage hovers uneasily between absurdity and deadly seriousness, with the superstition implicit in "certain mystic rhymes" vying with the deadly threat posed by battle-axes and drawn swords. Such a divided tone appears repeatedly in denunciations of trade unionism from the 1830s and 1840s, as critics of the unions seek to arouse public anxiety without attributing too much power to these irrational organizations.

Surrounding this titillating and arguably self-divided account of the initiation ceremony, a lengthy diatribe against trade unionism summarizes the statistical findings of the Select Committee. It is itself preceded by a much briefer passage demonstrating "the subtile activity of the principle which regulates the price of labour" among "the more educated circles of society . . . where moral and social considerations are paramount [and] the mere force of public opinion is found adequate to the desired end" (204). Here, the evils of trade unionism are used to generalize about the working class and its inability to self-regulate except through the "much coarser means" of violence and secrecy.[1] Among these "much coarser means" were the confirmed acts of violence during prolonged strikes—i.e. vitriol burning, physical assaults on "nobs," or strikebreakers, and arson. These actions made unions appear especially dangerous to those with a monetary stake in the various industries where unionism had a significant presence. Crimes directed at industrial capital also carried with them the aura of insurrection associated with such movements as Luddism (1811–17), the

Pentridge rising (1817), the "Last Labourers' Revolt" (1830) and the Captain Swing riots (1830–31),[2] thereby reinforcing the equation of secrecy and lawlessness already proposed and making such secrecy and lawlessness a primarily working-class phenomenon.

The secretive practice that receives the most attention in *The Annual Register* is oath-taking among union members. As a quintessential example of this practice the following oath, "said to have been administered by the combined spinners in Scotland, in 1823," is included: "I, A. B., do voluntarily swear in the awful presence of God Almighty, and before these witnesses, that I will execute with zeal, and alacrity, so far as in me lies, every task or injunction, which the majority of my brethren shall impose upon me, in furtherance of our common welfare; as the chastisement of "*knobs,*" the assassination of oppressive and tyrannical masters, or the demolition of shops, that shall be deemed incorrigible" (204–5). Thus strategically presented this oath would have alarmed the middle- and upper-class readers of *The Annual Register* for a number of reasons. At the basic level of content, the oath challenges laissez-faire economics and the system of social privilege it helped to perpetuate by demanding the unswerving and self-abnegating loyalty of members to democratically ordained violence against the established social order. Also, the above mock-union initiation intimates that most trade union oaths were sworn on the Bible, making them not merely socially binding (and therefore subject to the greater authority of constitutional law) but almost sacramental (and therefore unbreakable) by virtue of being sworn before God. The presence of union oaths could therefore interfere with the administration of justice by making union members unwilling to betray their sacred word and reveal the union's secrets. Members of more elite groups, like the Freemasons, would have also noticed the uncomfortable similarities between their own initiation oaths and those of the spinners union, both of which feature unswerving pledges of loyalty enforced by divine appeal and the threat of spectacular violence. This kind of symbolic convergence of classes had in the past generated considerable antipathy on the part of the middle and upper classes when deployed in public political space. Indeed, James Epstein traces several incidents of radical "ritual expression" that mirrored the practices of the traditionally powerful and prompted those in power to violently suppress their dangerously familiar working-class counterparts.[3]

Union oaths were additionally suspect because of the lingering effects of the Combination Acts of 1799. Made law in an effort to stamp out radical discontent and Jacobin sympathy with the French Revolution, the two Combination Acts severely restricted public assemblies and made all oaths not administered by an officer of the Crown acts of treason.[4] These restrictions were directed mainly at working-class organizations, with the result that memories of the Combination Acts tended to reinforce the class-bias already present in the anti-union position. The Acts were

repealed in 1824 by a law that Friedrich Engels describes as "enacted by the old, unreformed, oligarchic-Tory parliament, a law which never could have passed the House of Commons later, when the Reform Bill had legally sanctioned the distinction between bourgeoisie and proletariat, and made the bourgeoisie the ruling class."[5] However, the Combination Acts' prohibition of oath-taking retained a powerful hold over the English imagination. This hold is best illustrated by the *Report* itself, which grounds its pejorative examination of trade unions on an oath said to have been sworn fifteen years before, when such absolute solidarity was necessitated by the illegality of combination.[6]

In part, this tendency to conflate past and present evidence can be attributed to the difficulty of gathering accurate information about contemporary organizations defined as fundamentally secretive about their own inner workings. In other words, because he was bound by a powerful oath, one could never be absolutely certain that a given member knew everything, or had shared everything that he knew, or even if what he had shared was reliable. At its extreme, this problem of incomplete knowledge and potential unreliability could lead to the eschewal of evidence altogether, since lack of evidence might just as readily prove the existence of a secret conspiracy dedicated to, among other things, withholding that evidence. Once accusations of such secretive practices as oath-taking presented themselves as true by their very assertion, corollary accusations that a given trade union was really a dangerous conspiracy could also be accepted as true, thus allowing the trade union to become a secret society, something dangerous, wholly other and distinctly un-English.

Such specious reasoning was resisted by a number of social actors whenever it appeared. Trade union members and radical politicians and periodicals rightly considered it unfair, both because it forced unions into a position from which there was no escape and because it relied on tacit and contestable definitions of secrecy and Englishness. Even those willing to condemn trade unions recognized a potential danger in the interdependence of these definitions. By making oath-taking and other practices of secrecy the final arbiter of meaning, those who applied the figure of the secret society to trade unions left themselves open to the effects of their own rhetoric. If it could be demonstrated that supposedly "English" institutions also employed secretive practices analogous to those attributed to trade unions—as many of their members knew they did—then, according to the definition already implied in the initial collapse of secrecy and lawlessness, those English institutions could be labeled unlawful as well. This capacity of the figure of the secret society to cut both ways could ultimately lead, therefore, to a complete breakdown of the very binary opposition between open English institutions and their secretive un-English counterparts that middle- and upper-class critics of trade unions had sought to establish in the first place.

The potential instability of the rhetoric surrounding trade unionism can be seen most clearly in the 1838 trial of five Glasgow cotton-spinners on charges of conspiracy and murder. Reactions to the trial appeared in the periodical press, Parliamentary debates, and fiction of the period. With varying degrees of uneasiness, the majority of these texts portray trade unions as secret societies by making oath-taking an essential element of their representations. In 1) the 1838 trial and its aftereffects in Parliamentary debate, 2) the periodical press, and 3) Thomas Carlyle's *Chartism* (1839), treasonous oath-taking becomes the basis for the pejorative labeling of trade unions, and by extension the working classes, as dangerous secret societies. This pejorative label was intended to prove that the working classes were unsuited for full participation in English democracy because of their predilection for conspiratorial practices. However, the irony and hypocrisy of this collapse of secrecy, lawlessness, and the working classes can be challenged using two of the novels that follow the trial, since in Charles Dickens's *Barnaby Rudge* (1841) and Benjamin Disraeli's *Sybil* (1845), the figure of the secret society is extended to the upper classes as well. Dickens's novel represents trade unions as secret societies through an initiation ceremony into the fictitious 'Prentice Knights, but acknowledges that secret conspiracies may involve members of the upper and lower classes. Oath-taking at an initiation ceremony also grounds Disraeli's presentation of trade unionism, even as his novel as a whole demonstrates in a far more ambivalent fashion the degree to which secretive institutional practices operate at all levels of British society.

I. The Trials of the Glasgow Spinners

On the 3rd through the 11th of January, 1838, the High Court of Justiciary at Edinburgh conducted what Sidney and Beatrice Webb refer to as "one of the 'leading cases' of Trade Union history," the trial of Thomas Hunter, Peter Hacket, Richard M'Neil, James Gibb, and William M'Lean, better known as the Glasgow spinners (170). The Crown's thirty-four-page indictment charged these five men with twelve separate crimes: 1) that they did "wickedly and feloniously conspire, confederate, and agree together, to use intimidation, molestation, and threats, and to perpetrate acts of illegal violence against" the nobs and masters of various cotton mills in Glasgow, and formed a guard committee for that purpose (9)[7]; 2) that they did appoint "a great number" of members of the Glasgow spinners union to act as guards at the Oakbank Factory, where "the said guards, or other disorderly persons under their orders or direction, or abetted and encouraged by them" assaulted John Farmer and William Gordon (10–11); 3) that they similarly appointed guards for the Mile-End Spinning Company, where the said guards or others acting under direction from them

"did use menaces and threats of violence to the operatives . . . and did molest them . . . and did assault them, and did create great terror and alarm among them" (11–13); 4) that they did "wickedly and feloniously conspire, confederate, and agree together, to set fire to, or attempt to set fire to the cotton mill . . . occupied by William Hussey and Son" by hiring an unnamed person for the sum of £20 to set fire to the mill, and that someone did indeed unsuccessfully try to set it on fire, and that they then did attempt to force the masters of various Glasgow cotton mills to rehire their struck operatives (13–16); 5) that they did "by means of illegally and feloniously writing and sending threatening letters" attempt to compel the masters to rehire struck operatives and that they moved to appoint "a secret select committee, or a secret committee," the members of which were chosen "by ballot, or lot, or some other secret mode," in order to "overcome the opposition to the said strike, and to attempt illegally and forcibly to raise or keep up wages" (16–19); 6) that they did "wickedly and feloniously hire, engage, instigate, or direct" certain unnamed members of the spinners' union to assault David Gray and Edward Kean (19–20); 7–9) that they did write three threatening letters to various managers of cotton manufactories in Glasgow (20–24); 10) that they did "wickedly and feloniously hire, engage, instigate, or direct" six members of the union "to invade with force and violence" at night the house in which Thomas Donaghey was staying (24–26); 11) that they did "wickedly and feloniously, and maliciously hire, engage, instigate, or direct, a certain person or persons" unknown to set fire to the house of James Wood, and that such an attempt was unsuccessfully made (26–27); and 12) that they did "wickedly, feloniously, maliciously, and unlawfully, hire, engage, instigate, or direct, or procure" William M'Lean to "assassinate and murder" one John Smith for the sum of £20, which he did (27–30). To these voluminous charges was added the exhortation that these men "OUGHT to be punished with the pains of law, to deter others from committing the like crimes in all time coming" (32).

True to the conventions of contemporary Scottish law, the choice of adverbs and verbs in the indictment often causes it to grow from a legal accusation to a moral denunciation of the defendants and their union. Terms like "wickedly" and "feloniously" invariably add extralegal connotations to the avalanche of already-loaded verbs, "conspire, confederate, and agree together" or "hire, engage, instigate, or direct." In addition, there is an escalation in both the number and moralizing force of these adverbs and verbs as the charges progress. This rhetorical ratcheting-up does not differ in kind from other trials of the period, though it does exhibit a degree of escalation rarely seen in other legal cases. The indictment's closing comment does set it apart, however, both by employing the all-capital "OUGHT," with its connotations of moral instruction, and by casting this case as an example designed to prevent otherwise implicitly inevitable future outbreaks of trade union disorder.[8]

The majority of specific examples of trade union disorder provided by the indictment are structured around an elaborate attempt to cast the Spinners' Union as a conspiratorial secret society. Only charges one through three can stand alone, and these accusations of the resolution to use intimidation and its actual use at the Oakbank and Mile-End Factories are the least serious in the indictment. In contrast, charges four through twelve all rely to a greater or lesser extent on the presence of a "secret select committee" and the defendants' membership on that committee in order to be proven.[9] Decided on by some sort of dangerously democratic process and bound by an oath of secrecy, this committee—if it did indeed exist—would effectively transform the otherwise legal Glasgow Spinners' Union into a conspiratorial secret society headed by the first four defendants. Charges four through twelve were by far the more serious, then, not only because the punishments for fire-raising and murder were greater than those for assault, but also because definitively proving any of the latter charges would effectively make the Glasgow Spinners' Union an illegal combination. Perhaps the most striking result of this concentration on the practice of illegal combination is the way in which William M'Lean and the crime of which he is accused are almost superfluous to the charges. This relegation of the murder of John Smith to a mere dramatic instance of the alleged conspiracy suggests a certain amount of class prejudice behind the trial, in the sense that the life of a specific working-class man is subordinated to the more general threat to property posed by the Spinners' Union.

Following the pattern established by the indictment, the greater proportion of the trial focuses on the conspiracy charges, with special attention given to the existence or lack thereof of oath-taking and other signs of a conspiratorial secret society. Three of the prosecution's main witnesses, James Murdoch, William Smith and Robert Christie, all operative cotton-spinners and members of the Glasgow Spinners' Union, testified to the existence of oath-taking and other secret signs. According to Murdoch, the union had administered an oath since his induction in 1816, and had altered it in 1822, "and the change on the oath was a great deal for the worse; it became more vicious in its nature" (73). Although he could not recollect the exact wording, he did remember that both oaths were sworn on the Bible, with the words "Ashdod" (Isaiah 20.1) and "Armageddon" (Revelation 16.16) being used. Murdoch also testified that the union had had a "secret committee" intermittently since 1818, and that this committee had in the past employed intimidation, fire-raising, and other illegal acts under the code-word "Colliery" (74). His testimony concerning the existence of a secret committee appeared to confirm earlier statements by the prosecution's star witness, James Moat, that there had definitely been a secret committee during the strike of 1824 and that he believed that a similar committee had been formed in 1837. Smith corroborated the practice of oath-taking and the use of the

word "Armageddon," though he denied ever seeing a bible at his initiation (161). The majority of the defense witnesses then testified that their initiations into the union had featured neither an oath nor the words "Ashdod" and "Armageddon," and that they had never heard the word "Colliery" used in connection with any secret committee, of which they knew nothing. For the purposes of this study the most striking testimony may have come from Robert Christie, who confirmed Murdoch's testimony on the presence of oath-taking using a bible opened to a passage featuring the word "Armageddon" (142), even as he admitted his own reluctance to testify due to "fear, and the dread of breaking the oath" (152). Christie's fear and dread was doubtless partly founded on the possibility of union retribution, but his reluctance also points to the fact that the union's practice of oath-taking introduced a basis of allegiance that could conflict with one's duty as a subject of the Crown.

Oath-taking and other practices of secrecy remained central through both sides' closing statements. Relying largely on the testimony of Murdoch and Moat, the Lord Advocate declared that "while this association pretended to be doing nothing but what was perfectly legal, they were secretly and darkly carrying into effect . . . the greatest crimes" (245–46). These "deeds of violence and atrocity" were carefully distanced by being labeled "so unlike the character of this country; and so different from the usual feelings of Scotchmen" as to be almost incomprehensible by any who do not suffer from the "perversion of moral feeling which gave rise to them" (246). Almost apologetically, the Lord Advocate also admitted the "great difficulty, on the part of the Crown, of establishing this prosecution by evidence" (248), due largely to the "strong impression" caused by the administration of "an oath on the Scripture, not to reveal the secrets of the association" designed to "pervert" the mind of those who take it (248–49).

This clear reference back to the reluctance shown by Robert Christie introduces the possibility that hard evidence may not be the only way to detect a union conspiracy. Combined with the retroactive proof of a past conspiracy established by the testimony of Murdoch and Smith, this explanation of the difficulty of establishing proof due to the presence of un-English, un-Scottish, morally perverse oath-taking forms the basis of the prosecution's case, which is now proven not only by actual evidence, but also by the lack of that evidence.

These two paralogisms come under direct attack in the closing statements by the defense. Mr. M'Neill, lawyer for all but M'Lean, begins his remarks by reminding the jury that despite the fact that "the largest, and by far the most striking part of the evidence . . . related to . . . offences said to have been committed between the years 1818 and 1830," most of which occurred prior to the repeal of the Combination Acts, the defendants "are now on trial for certain offences said to have been committed between the months of April and July, 1837, and for these only"

(283). By revealing that the prosecutor's case implied that the defendants "are in this way answerable, not directly, but indirectly, for offences not committed by themselves, but committed by other persons long before the prisoners . . . had even become cotton-spinners" (285), M'Neill effectively undercuts the first paralogism undergirding the prosecution's case. He then goes on to show how the bulk of the charges rely on the presence of a secret committee, the existence of which he disputes using conflicts among the testimony of various witnesses, thereby attacking the second paralogism by discounting the initial accusation of secretive practices (291–95).

The conventions of the Scottish court allowed for a further restatement of the entire case by the Lord Justice-Clerk after the defense had finished. In his lengthy (thirteen-and-a-half-hour) re-presentation of the case, the Lord Justice-Clerk attempted to repair some of the damage done by M'Neill's closing statement by reminding the jury of the difficulty of obtaining evidence due to the complicating factor of oath-taking (357) and by rereading verbatim some of the testimony of the prosecution's key witnesses, minus cross-examination and the defense's counter-witnesses (358). His restatement of the defense's case was somewhat less generous in that he punctuated his remarks with questions and even reminders of key elements of the prosecution's case.[10]

Despite the efforts of the prosecution and of the Lord Justice-Clerk on behalf of the prosecution, the jury returned a verdict largely in favor of the defendants. Specifically, after a deliberation of five hours a slim majority found charges one, two and three "against all the pannels proven" and all other charges they unanimously found "not proven."[11] Such a verdict was possible in Scotland because at the time a trial verdict required only a majority decision, whereas in England a unanimous decision was necessary. This peculiarity of Scottish law made even this partial conviction of the least serious offenses seem less condemning than one might have expected from the rhetoric of conspiracy bandied about during the trial, especially when compared with the unanimous verdict of not proven for the majority of charges.

Even with this mainly exculpatory verdict, the judges pronounced the unusually harsh sentence of seven years transportation, making it clear in their final remarks that they, at least, believed the defendants guilty of far more than they had been convicted of. Indeed, Lord Mackenzie seemed to ignore entirely the jury's verdict in his remarks, declaring "the conspiracy in which the prisoners joined, was a combination not merely to raise wages, but to do so by using illegal means" (376), and describing this "conspiracy" as "widely spread, as all the evidence shews" (379), despite the fact that the charge of conspiracy had been found not proven. His closing remarks applied his assumption of the defendants' guilt to the Glasgow Spinners' Union as a whole: "I consider this Association as one of the most dangerous conspiracies that has been seen in this country for a long period" (380). The Lord Justice-Clerk concurred, misrepresenting the jury's verdict in the strength of his own conviction that

> The verdict of the Jury has stamped this Association of cotton-spinners in Glasgow, as an unlawful Association; and no man that heard the evidence, with regard to its nature, its character, and its proceedings, even for a considerable period of time previous to commission of those acts of conspiracy, can entertain the slightest doubt, that it was unlawful in its structure, utterly unlawful in its objects, utterly unlawful in the means which it resorted to for the purpose of effecting those objects. . . . [T]his was an Association of a most illegal and dangerous description—illegal in its nature, most injurious and dangerous in its consequences, not only to the public, but to the members of the Association themselves. (381)

He continued, characterizing the Glasgow Spinners' Union as "a species of slavery," and finding it the duty (and, one suspects, the pleasure) of the court, "to convince the people of this country, that the practice of this most dangerous system will no longer be permitted to exist within the bounds of this kingdom" (381). Thus, for the purposes of "deterring others" and "bringing a part of the community back into a state of order . . . particularly that class to which you belong" (381), the sentence was meted out. These comments by Lord Mackenzie and the Lord Justice-Clerk provide the clearest indication of the process of distancing as dangerous others not only the defendants, but the members of the spinners' unions and even the entire working class, permitted by the strategic accusation of the presence of a "secret select committee," or more broadly of a "conspiracy." Even though this accusation was found "not proven" by the jury, its very articulation was enough to prompt moral disapprobation and seven years' transportation. By all but ignoring the jury's verdict and punishing the defendants with seven years' transportation, the judges effectively underwrote their decision using the figure of the secret society, and in so doing made secretive practices the final measure of meaning in the trial and in future public reactions to it.

These public reactions sided almost unanimously with the prosecution and the judges. The newspaper press was particularly unmerciful in its denunciations of the spinners, and of trade unionism more generally, as these remarks from William Lovett, president of the Working Men's Association and co-author of *The People's Charter,* make clear: "The horrible charges trumped up against these men were re-echoed through the press, as the acts and deeds of *trade unions in general,* and no language was thought too severe to be used against them" (131). Perhaps the best measure of public feeling in the aftermath of the trial comes from the unusually sympathetic opening of an article in the February edition of *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine:*

> We have no ambition to emulate the elegant invectives against the proceedings of the Glasgow Cotton-Spinners Union, in which a large portion of the press have

> been indulging. Their proceedings have been bad enough, to be sure, but we cannot see the parallel between them and the crimes of Burke. Neither can we see in them any trace of national demoralization. Comparatively speaking, there are few, even of the working-classes, implicated in these transactions; and, as to their enormity, "let him who is without sin throw the first stone." ("The Trial of the Glasgow Cotton Spinners," 78)[12]

Contemporary articles in *Blackwood's* and the *Edinburgh Review* were more typical in their reactions to the trial. Both felt quite sure not only of the defendants' guilt but also of the propriety of generalizing about the guilt of trade unionism generally:

> [A]lthough the evidence, in the opinion of the jury, failed to connect the prisoners with the more aggravated of these charges, yet they were all fully proved to have been committed by some person connected with, and in the interests of, the Combination ("Trades' Unions and Strikes" 233)[13]; not a human being can doubt that the whole were proved to a demonstration against the combination generally. ("Practical Working of Trades' Unions," 296)

Combinations were especially dangerous because of the relatively high level of education enjoyed by their members. Indeed, one article laments that trade union debates "are conducted by these highly educated and skilful workmen, in the language, and with all the forms of the House of Commons" ("Practical Working of Trades' Unions," 284).[14] However, this very education makes the individual workmen susceptible to logical persuasion, and both articles assiduously attempt to employ such persuasion in their largely statistical proofs of how injurious strikes are for the striking workers. At least one article, however, has a back-up plan in case such proofs fail: the establishment of a permanent police force "*capable of supporting the civil magistrate* in his contest with such organized and formidable confederacies" ("Practical Working of Trades' Unions," 302).

Feelings in Parliament toward the spinners largely matched those of the periodical press. On February 9, 1838, Lord Brougham presented a petition before the House of Lords asking for clemency towards the five cotton-spinners on the grounds that they had only been convicted of the least serious charges against them and that had the trial taken place in an English court, the conviction never would have occurred. Further, he argued that even had an English jury convicted these men of the same charges, the seven months they spent in jail prior to their trial would have exceeded by five months the maximum sentence that could have been handed down in an English court (*Hansard,* 40: 931–35). This petition for clemency was greeted by a spirited denunciation of illegal combinations and of trade unions more gener-

ally offered by Viscount Melbourne, who declared "that these men had been convicted of an offence of a most pernicious character . . . and [that] the more open the law had been made for allowing men to enter into combinations, the more necessary it was to check any attempt at violent proceedings by the most serious punishments which the law allowed" (*Hansard,* 40: 937). He continued, reflecting on the abolition of the combination laws in 1824, "when the combination laws were abolished, the fault which was found with the proceeding was, that the penalties were too weak and too light: and he must say, that if the offence were proven to [the] extent charged against these persons, the punishment which was assigned to it was not excessive, nor the infliction of it unjust" (*Hansard,* 40: 938). All these remarks were framed by his assertions that he "begged leave to say, that he did not intend to give an opinion on this case" (*Hansard,* 40: 938).

In the House of Commons, the reaction to the trial went a bit further. From a largely sympathetic petition presented by Mr. Wakely on the twenty-fifth of January, 1838 calling for a select committee to investigate the Glasgow spinners' union and the trial (*Hansard,* 40: 473–76),[15] the House quickly moved to appoint the much more general Select Committee on Combinations to investigate trade unionism throughout the British Isles. This shift to a more general committee was the brainchild of Mr. Daniel O'Connell, who in his remarks offered several pregnant observations on the practice of combination:

> The fact was, that there was nothing but combinations amongst the rich from one end of the country to the other. He had no hesitation in saying that there was a trade union in that House. The landed proprietors in that House constituted a large majority, and took care to prevent any alteration in the law which would make corn cheap. . . . Again, had they not a trade union in the Temple. Had they not in that place a recent and remarkable instance of conspiracy. . . . When there was such a remarkable instance of the preventing the acquisition of rank and wealth in a liberal profession, by a combination of a detestable clique in the heart of the metropolis, they should not make such loud complaints of combinations of working men at distant places who had such difficulties to contend with. (*Hansard,* 40: 1067–68)[16]

These rather broad hints of upper-class conspiracies went unacknowledged in the House, which elected to confine the select committee's scope to trade unions only, with the results already noted above.

Despite the vehemence and extent of the periodical and Parliamentary reactions to the trial, however, it remained for Thomas Carlyle in *Chartism* to offer the most scathing representation of the Glasgow spinners. Scattered among his more general

comments on the nature of working-class unrest and the need for a national program of religious education to end it, are three references to something called "Glasgow Thuggery." The most general of these connects this phenomenon to past examples of semi-revolutionary working-class unrest, representing them all as symptoms of a national disease: "Glasgow Thuggery, Chartist torch-meetings, Birmingham riots, Swing conflagrations, are so many symptoms on the surface; you abolish the symptom to no purpose, if the disease is left untouched" (*Works,* 29: 120).[17] These "symptoms" had all been extensively recorded in the popular press, accompanied by appropriate catch phrases and a certain amount of moral horror. Carlyle appears dismissive, or at least distrustful, of these accounts, even as he reproduces them in his critique: "'Glasgow Thuggery,' 'Glasgow Thugs'; it is a witty nick-name: the practice of 'Number 60' entering his dark room, to contract for and settle the price of blood with operative assassins, in a Christian city, once distinguished by its rigorous Christianism, is doubtless a fact worthy of all horror: but what will horror do for it" (*Works,* 29: 119). Indeed, Carlyle seems to share the newspapers' horror at this violation of the sacredness of his "Christian city," though his disapprobation is expressed in more exacting terms:

> Glasgow Thuggery speaks aloud, too, is a language we may well call infernal. What kind of 'wild-justice' must be in the hearts of these men that prompts them, with cold deliberation, in conclave assembled, to doom their brother workman, as deserter of his order and his order's cause, to die as traitor and deserter; and have him executed, since not by any public judge and hangman, then by a private one. . . . Not loyal loving obedience to those placed over them, but a far other temper, must animate these men! (*Works,* 29: 148–49)

In Carlyle's diagnosis, "Glasgow Thuggery," with all of its violent disregard for "Christianism," displays an infernal inversion of the moral order. Horror by itself, then, will not suffice for reinstating the proper "loyal loving obedience"; only a religious reeducation can save those implicitly damned by their own violent circumvention of civil order.

Carlyle's specificity in these passages makes it quite clear that, as Patrick Brantlinger observes, "When Carlyle speaks of 'Glasgow Thuggery' in *Chartism,* he has in mind a specific strike—that of the Glasgow cotton spinners in 1837—and the violence arising out of it" (Brantlinger, "The Case," 37).[18] Somewhat less obvious for a modern reader, but perhaps more important, are the implications of the term "Thuggery." This "witty nick-name" would have called to mind a very specific reference for readers in the 1830s and 1840s, as it did for Engels, who explains that the Glasgow Thugs were "so called from the East Indian tribe, whose only trade is the murder of all the strangers who fall into its hands" (Engels, *Condition of the Working-*

Class, 221). These worshippers of the Indian goddess Kali had first come to the attention of British authorities in 1799, but it was not until the publication of Dr. Richard Sherwood's "Of the Murderers Called Phansigars," in 1816 that the extent of their organization became known.[19] Readers in the 1830s would have had this group fresh in their minds from the publication of Captain W. H. Sleeman's *Ramaseeana, or Vocabulary of the Peculiar Language used by the Thugs, with an Introduction and Appendix, descriptive of the System pursued by that Fraternity, and of the Measures which have been adopted by the Supreme Government of India for its suppression* (1836).

Sleeman's book was reviewed in the *Edinburgh Review* (January 1837) and the *Foreign Quarterly Review* (April 1838), either of which would have made Carlyle and others' association of the Spinners with Thuggee particularly damaging to trade unionism. According to the reviews, Sleeman's book had provided "overwhelming evidence" of "a vast fraternity of murderers, consisting of many thousands of persons," operating until recently without restraint throughout the Indian subcontinent ("The Thugs; or, Secret Murderers of India," 357). This "extraordinary organized society of ruthless villains" was composed of two classes: Burkas, or stranglers, and Kuboolas, or novices ("The Thugs, or Phansigars," 1),[20] a distinction which neatly mirrors the difference between members of a "secret select committee" and ordinary union members. Readers of the Report of the Select Committee on Combinations as summarized in *The Annual Register* might also recognize similarities between the committee's generalizations about mystic ritualism in trade unions and the Thugs' "variety of signs and symbols" and veneration of the pickaxe ("The Thugs, or Phansigars," 5).[21]

Specific textual similarities between these reviews and *Chartism* make Carlyle's characterization of the Glasgow spinners as the Glasgow Thugs even more explicit in its labeling of the Glasgow Spinners' Union as a dangerous secret society.[22] Carlyle's disgust at the "wild-justice," or alternative morality, grounding the spinners' alleged acts of terrorism and murder exhibits a remarkable similarity to one reviewer's amusement over the "superiority which the Thugs assume over ordinary murderers" as a result of "the peculiar religious belief . . . that they draw a distinction between Thuggee and murder" ("The Thugs; or, Secret Murderers of India," 383). This distinction leads quite naturally to one-sided comparisons between Christianity and the Thugs' "distorted state of morals" much like Carlyle's implied contrast between the once "rigorous Christianisn" of Scotland and the moral system adopted by the Glasgow spinners ("The Thugs; or, Secret Murderers of India," 383, 394). Carlyle's metaphoric relation of Glasgow Thuggery and disease also echoes a similar representation of the nature of Thuggee prior to Sleeman's finally organizing a national body dedicated to systematically prosecuting them:

> The full extent of the evil, however, was not then known; and whilst our active magistrates flattered themselves that they had put a stop to the practice, it was really only temporarily suspended in their own neighborhood. A system which embraced the whole of India could not be suppressed by a few partial inroads upon it. The dispersion of the gangs had the usual effect of a persecution which does not go the length of entire eradication. ("The Thugs; or, Secret Murderers of India," 367)

The subtle application of the term "persecution" instead of "prosecution" makes clear that what was needed in India was not a strictly legal solution. The reviewer's horror at the depravity of the Thugs leads him to righteously conclude, "If any practice at all approaching in atrocity to that of Thuggee, were to be discovered in England, it would be immediately put down by a united effort of the whole people" ("The Thugs; or, Secret Murderers of India," 393). Those who considered the Glasgow spinners as a kind of English Thuggee sought to motivate just such a reaction by the judicious application of the label of secret society to English trade unions in the aftermath of the Glasgow spinners trial.

II. From the 'Prentice Knights to the SEVEN

The trial of the Glasgow spinners, and the strategies of representation that emerged from it remained active in public opinion and the fictional press for at least ten years.[23] In fact, two of the most important political/historical novels written in the next decade, *Barnaby Rudge* and *Sybil,* both employ much of the information collected about trade unionism as a result of the trial in their own representations of trade unions.[24] Both Dickens and Disraeli also rely upon the corollary method of valuation-by-secrecy popularized during the trial. However, their use of the figure of the secret society ultimately reveals its capacity to define not just trade unions, but also wealthy associations and even Parliament. In this way the novels work together to respond to the latent implications of the trial, finally suggesting that a definition of Englishness negatively constructed out of condemnations of secrecy cannot hold up under scrutiny.

Originally conceived of in 1836 as a historical romance in the tradition of Scott's *Waverly* and *The Heart of Midlothian,*[25] *Barnaby Rudge,* by the time Dickens began writing it in earnest in 1839, and certainly by the time it began appearing in 1841 in *Master Humphrey's Clock,* had grown to include far more than the story of Gabriel Varden set against the Gordon Riots of 1780.[26] For the purposes of this study, one of the most significant changes to the final draft is the inclusion of Sim Tappertit and his quasi-trade union, the 'Prentice Knights, later renamed the United Bulldogs. Critics

have been comparatively reticent about this addition, which is curious, since Sim not only plays a role in the riots comparable to that of Dennis, Hugh or Barnaby, but he arguably provides for their participation by his own activity as a mob leader.[27] Moreover, as the founder of the 'Prentice Knights/United Bulldogs, Sim allows for the introduction of a fictional secret society based at least in part on the Glasgow spinners. Though, as A. E. Dyson notes, it is singularly difficult to determine the novel's tone towards Sim and his organization (68), a close examination of the structure of *Barnaby Rudge* reveals that they occupy a pivotal role in the novel's representation of social disorder.

Sim Tappertit enters the narrative in the fourth chapter of *Barnaby Rudge,* and even in this first presentation the novel displays a remarkable ambiguity of tone toward him. Unknowingly caught in the act of eavesdropping on a conversation between Gabriel and Dolly Varden, Sim's first appearance is marred by being focalized through the locksmith's consciousness. Thus, his initial illicit listening and elaborate toilet are filtered through Varden's judgments of them as "A bad habit . . . a sneaking, underhanded way" and "Now he's going to beautify himself—here's a precious locksmith," making Sim's later admiration of his legs, "which, in knee breeches, were perfect curiosities of littleness," and "the power of his eye" seem that much more ridiculous to the reader (4.78, 79).[28] This initial focalization is almost certainly what moves Dyson to describe Sim as "Neat, dandified, a vain and bumptious little malcontent, he is as ludicrous to his allies as to his foes" (55). However, a darker, much more serious side to Sim's character is revealed by the narrator, who compares Sim's fatuous self-admiration to an overfilled cask: "As certain liquors, confined in casks too cramped in their dimensions, will ferment, and fret, and chafe in their imprisonment, so the spiritual essence or soul of Mr Tappertit would sometimes fume within that precious cask, his body, until, with great foam and froth and splutter, it would force a vent, and carry all before it" (4.80). It is easy to see the sexual overtones of this characterization and even to predict that Dolly Varden will be seriously threatened by Sim's bottled virility later in the novel. However, Sim's incipient explosiveness has much wider social implications than just the sexual menacing of Dolly Varden. Sim also has plans to menace his mother country:

> Sim Tappertit, among the other fancies upon which his before-mentioned soul was for ever feasting and regaling itself (and which fancies, like the liver of Prometheus, grew as they were fed upon), had a mighty notion of his order; and had been heard by the servant-maid openly expressing his regret that the 'prentices no longer carried clubs wherewith to mace the citizens: that was his strong expression. He was likewise reported to have said that in former times a stigma had been cast upon the body by the execution of George Barnwell, to which they should not

> have basely submitted, but should have demanded him of the legislature—temperately at first; then by an appeal to arms, if necessary—to be dealt with as they in their wisdom might think fit. These thoughts always led him to consider what a glorious engine the 'prentices might yet become if they had but a master spirit at their head; and then he would darkly, and to the terror of his hearers, hint at certain reckless fellows that he knew of, and at a certain Lion Heart ready to become their captain, who, once afoot, would make the Lord Mayor tremble on his throne. (4.80)

The outlet for Sim's fantasies of power are the self-described "secret society of 'Prentice Knights" (8.112), a group of disaffected "reckless fellows" who gather in the blind-man Stagg's basement room in the Barbican to play at skittles, dice and cards and to hatch plots against "the masters." As with their leader, the 'Prentice Knights seem on several levels to suffer from a certain amount of ridiculousness. Historically, the presence of an apprentices' conspiracy in the late eighteenth century is anachronistic, to say the least.[29] Indeed, Dickens's choice to include a trade-union-like conspiracy departs from all of his known historical sources. Three of these sources—Thomas Holcroft's *A Plain and Succinct Narrative of the Late Riots, The Thunderer,* and Robert Watson's *The Life of George Gordon*—do propose a conspiracy theory to account for the Gordon riots, but all believe that this conspiracy originates outside of England, from either American, French or Papal sources.[30] The most common and widely accepted explanation for this historical anomaly is that, in his depiction of the Gordon Riots in *Barnaby Rudge* "Dickens was, consciously or unconsciously, suggesting that something similar was the case with the then contemporary Chartist movement and its leaders" (Jackson, *Charles Dickens,* 28).[31] Certainly the 'Prentice Knights seem much more at home in the 1830s than in the 1770s, and this connection becomes almost incontestable when we know that Dickens read Carlyle's *Chartism* while writing *Barnaby Rudge*.[32]

However, this explanation of their historical infidelity does not absolve the 'Prentice Knights of their institutional ludicrousness. Born out of the foaming and spluttering of Sim Tappertit's soul and dedicated to securing the rights of the apprentices to their masters' daughters, the 'Prentice Knights conduct their secret meetings in a snail- and slug-rich cellar used, "at a no very distant period . . . as a storehouse for cheeses; a circumstance which, while it accounted for the greasy moisture that hung about it, was agreeably suggestive of rats" (8.110). These meetings of the member-rats parody to absurdity the "*insignia* of terror" said by *The Annual Register, 1838* to characterize the nocturnal meetings of trade unions: "battle-axes, drawn swords, [and] skeletons" become a "rusty blunderbuss," a "very ancient saber," and a "chair of state, cheerfully ornamented with a couple of skulls" (8.114, 114, 112). The organization's

credibility is not increased by its changeable name; in the second half of the novel, an exchange between Gashford and Lord George reveals that the members have found it necessary to rename their group the United Bulldogs because of the "indentures of the old members expiring by degrees" (36.344). In other words, the hated masters have been so unjust as to train the leaders of the group into journeymen, making their earlier name, and by implication their earlier goals, obsolete.

Given this silly side of the 'Prentice Knights, it may be tempting to simply dismiss them as comic relief.[33] This conclusion would be premature, however, in light of their much more serious side as expressed in their initiation oath. This oath, "which was of a dreadful and impressive kind," binds the new member "at the bidding of his chief, to resist and obstruct the Lord Mayor, sword-bearer, and chaplain; to despise the authority of the sheriffs; and to hold the court of aldermen as nought; but not on any account, in case the fulness of time should bring a general rising of 'prentises, to damage or 'n any way disfigure Temple Bar, which was strictly constitutional and always to be approached with reverence" (8.115–16). Though accompanied by various burlesqued elements of a trade union initiation, the content of this oath amounts to a declaration of revolution against that portion of government presiding over the City of London. Moreover, instead of requiring agreement among the majority of members, this revolution can be ordered by a single man, making it much more dangerous even than the oath of the Glasgow spinners and their contemporaries. Finally, as Spence's note to this passage makes clear, in its reverence for the Temple Bar, the 'Prentice Knights' oath was meant to further horrify early-nineteenth-century liberal readers: "How constitutional the gateway erected after the Great Fire must have appeared to Sim Tappertit, may be judged from the fact that it was ornamented with statues of James I, Charles I, and Charles II—monarchs whom Dickens hated—and was garnished, until 1772, with the mangled remains of traitors."[34]

The actions of members of the Knights—now known as the United Bulldogs—during the riots reveals the organization's latent revolutionary tendencies in action. The newly-initiated Hugh especially distinguishes himself for ferocity, declaring before the assembled Bulldogs, "'Here's my captain—here's my leader. Ha ha ha! Let him give me the word of command, and I'll fight the whole Parliament House single-handed, or set a lighted torch to the King's throne itself!'" (39.368–69). Later during the same meeting, even Hugh becomes aware "of the presence of an air of mystery, akin to that which had so much impressed him out of doors. It was impossible to discard a sense that something serious was going on, and that under the noisy revel of the public-house there lurked unseen and dangerous matter" (39.371). Indeed, once the riots get underway, Hugh and other members of a similarly serious nature demonstrate just how dangerous the United Bulldogs can be by besieging Parliament (49.457), assaulting the Horse Guards (49.459), destroying Catholic churches

(50.464; 52.481–82), burning the Warren (chapter 55), breaking the prisoners out of Newgate after "swearing a great oath . . . to force the doors and burn the jail; or perish in the fire themselves" (60.550), and altogether making it appear "as if the city were invaded by a foreign army" (50.464).

As these actions during the riots make evident, the 'Prentice Knights / United Bulldogs are positioned in the thick of the novel's complex representation of civil disorder. Numerous critics have noticed that *Barnaby Rudge* is structured by means of the characteristically Dickensian motif of doubling. Steven Connor argues that the novel at its most abstract level presents a conflict between two visions of the city-as-body.[35] This conflict is itself embodied in the temporal discrepancy between the novel's conflicting portraits of England in 1774–75 and in 1780 (chapters 1–32 and 33–79) and in the plot by the parallel representations of disorder evidenced by the Haredale murder and the Gordon Riots. At the level of characterization, even, the novel seems to generate characters who are physical and moral shadows of one another.[36] Such a grouping of characters into complementary pairs underlies, for example, Steven Marcus and Myron Magnet's psychoanalytic readings of the father and son figures in the novel. The almost obsessive devotion to this doubling motif leads Kim Michasiw to identify the central "message" of *Barnaby Rudge* as a moral dialectic between rebellion and stability, madness and civilization: "Rebellion is essential to the formation of identity, yet some bounds must be placed upon it. What *Rudge* posits is that the sources of madness and of civilized order in its highest form are identical—in the rivalry between father and son, between the present and the dead weight of anteriority" (581). What all of these analyses of doubling fail to account for is the structural role that the novel accords to the 'Prentice Knights / United Bulldogs; in fact, this self-proclaimed secret society serves as the center point connecting the novel's doubled poles of disorder.[37]

These poles are most obviously represented by the novel's double plot. The two narratives of the Haredale murder and the Gordon Riots bring ruptures of the social order at the individual and the national level together into an almost organic whole.[38] By making the early murder, with its undertones of fratricide, the frame within which the Gordon Riots take place, Dickens seems to suggest that national disturbance can be traced to individual wrong-doing, thereby making the novel "preeminently concerned with the implications of individual action" (Rice, "The End of Dickens's Apprenticeship," 174).[39] Steven Marcus offers the most succinct summary of the implications of this connection between individual and national disorder when he states that *Barnaby Rudge*

> is concerned with authority in political and social relations, as well as in personal and private ones. Among its most notable qualities are the intelligence and skill with which it connects these two kinds of relations, and the steadiness with which it elu-

> cidates the 'intimate relation' between them. This insistence upon the reciprocal dependence of politics and character . . . in effect denies to politics the autonomy—the claim to "objectivity"—that those involved in politics regularly need to assert. (172)

One might add that the opposite is also true: the reciprocal dependence of politics and character also denies to the private sphere the autonomy from public life that it was so often accorded in the Victorian period. This parallel relationship between the supposedly "separate spheres" is implicit throughout the novel, which reveals the origin of the Gordon Riots in the machinations of Gashford and the irrational nostalgia of Gordon even as it finds the solution to those same riots in the restoration of domestic peace through the marriages of Edward Chester to Emma Haredale and Joe Willet to Dolly Varden.

However, there are also at least two more explicit connections between the domestic and national scenes in *Barnaby Rudge*. The first emerges from the plotting of Sir John Chester, whose efforts at preventing the marriage of Edward and Emma intriguingly parallel his exertions at fomenting the riots. Recognizing that Dolly Varden serves as the illicit messenger between Edward and Emma, Sir John wisely appeals to her mother, winning her over in language more reminiscent of international politics than interfamilial relations: "Mrs. Varden was but a woman, and had her share of vanity, obstinacy, and love of power. She entered into a secret treaty of alliance, offensive and defensive, with her insinuating visitor; and really did believe, as many others would have done who saw and heard him, that in so doing she furthered the ends of truth, justice, and morality, in a very uncommon degree" (27.274). His reason for securing such a "secret treaty" is principally his lingering jealousy as an unsuccessful suitor of the woman who became Haredale's wife. This same personal rancor motivates his actions behind the scenes of the Protestant Association's crusade against English Catholics, including especially Mr. Haredale, who perceptively responds to Sir John's denial of direct involvement with the Protestant Association, "'Men of your capacity plot in secrecy and safety, and leave exposed posts to the duller wits'" (43.404).

The 'Prentice Knights / United Bulldogs provide the second explicit connection between the domestic and national, past and present scenes of disorder. As a secret organization of socially and professionally similar individuals—and the echoes of trade unions like the Glasgow Spinners should be clear—the Knights as an institution occupy a middle ground between the public and private spheres. Moreover, the individual members of the Knights live with one foot in each of the novel's two plots: Sim Tappertit, when not presiding over midnight meetings of his society, lives at the home of Gabriel Varden, who is at once the father of Dolly, for whom Sim tends a secret flame, and the novel's heroic symbol of domestic and social order; likewise, Hugh, when not

leading attacks on the Warren or Newgate on behalf of the Bulldogs, serves as the stablehand at the Maypole Inn, itself the novel's main symbol of an ordered past. This connection between the various ordered and disordered worlds of the novel through these two members of the Bulldogs is stated explicitly in one exchange between them:

> "Come!" said Mr Tappertit, growing a little impatient under this disrespectful treatment. "Do you know me, feller?"
> "Not I," cried Hugh. "Ha ha ha! Not I! But I should like to."
> "And yet I'd have wagered a seven-shilling piece," said Mr Tappertit, folding his arms, and confronting him with his legs wide apart and firmly planted on the ground, "that you once were hostler at the Maypole."
> Hugh opened his eyes on hearing this, and looked at him in great surprise. (39.367)

Doubtless some of Hugh's surprise comes from the unremarkability of Sim Tappertit to anyone but himself, but this surprise may also reflect a moment of "eye-opening" on the part of the reader, who is made to realize in this scene just how porous the divide between order and disorder can be.

The 'Prentice Knights / United Bulldogs' practices of secrecy also provide a way to begin to connect two more of the novel's doubled poles. Chapter 37 begins with some general observations on the seductiveness of secrecy: "To surround anything, however monstrous or ridiculous, with an air of mystery, is to invest it with a secret charm, and power of attraction which to the crowd is irresistible. False priests, false prophets, false doctors, false patriots, false prodigies of every kind, veiling their proceedings in mystery, have always addressed themselves at an immense advantage to the popular credulity . . ." (37.347). Given the earlier secretive rigmarole depicted in the 'Prentice Knights' first initiation ceremony and Hugh's perception of a "sense of mystery" immediately after his initiation, one might expect that these general observations are meant to apply to Sim's secret society. Thus, it is rather surprising when in the next paragraph the passage continues,

> . . . But when vague rumors got abroad, that in this Protestant association, a secret power was mustering against the government for undefined and mighty purposes; when the air was filled with whispers of a confederacy among the Popish powers to degrade and enslave England, establish an Inquisition in London, and turn the pens of Smithfield market into stakes and cauldrons; when terrors and alarms which no man understood were perpetually broached, both in and out of Parliament, by an enthusiast who did not understand himself, and bygone bugbears

> which had lain quietly in their graves for centuries, were raised again to haunt the ignorant and credulous; when all this was done, as it were, in the dark, and secret invitations to join the Great Protestant Association in defense of religion, life, and liberty, were dropped in the public ways, thrust under house-doors, tossed in at windows, and pressed into the hands of those who trod the streets by night . . . then the mania spread indeed, and the body, still increasing every day, grew forty thousand strong. (37.348)

This parallel between the 'Prentice Knights and the Protestant Association, coupled with Sir John's own secretive plotting, implies that the division between rich and poor proposed in the aftermath of the Glasgow spinners' trial by Lord MacKenzie, the Lord Justice-Clerk, the *Report of the Select committee on Combinations* and Carlyle's *Chartism,* may not hold up if one examines their common reliance on secretive practices.

The next logical step, that secretive practices may be a ubiquitous condition of modern England, never quite materializes in *Barnaby Rudge.* In fact, the novel seems at pains to back away from this conclusion, scrupulously punishing everyone who ever kept illicit secrets. Sir John is killed in a duel with Mr. Hareton, and his body left unfound for two days on the Warren estate. Adding insult to injury, his "faithful valet, true to his master's creed, eloped with all the cash and movables he could lay his hands on, and started as a finished gentleman upon his own account" (82.731). The leaders of the riots, Hugh and Dennis the hangman, are hanged in the square outside of Newgate prison, while Lord George is confined to the Tower, where he eventually dies seven years later, imprisoned on unrelated matters. For Sim is reserved the most viciously reciprocal punishment of all: his legs "crushed into shapeless ugliness" and later replaced by wooden prosthetics (71.647), he becomes a shoeblack and marries the widow of a rag and bone collector, who occasionally resolves their domestic disagreements "by taking off his legs, and leaving him exposed to the derision of those urchins who delight in mischief" (82.734).

Even in this final restoration of social order, however, there remains a hint at the suppressed ubiquity of secretive practices in the fate of Gashford. After escaping official retribution and abandoning his position as Lord George's secretary and aide-de-camp, he "subsist[s] for a time upon his traffic in his master's secrets; and, this trade failing when the stock was quite exhausted, procure[s] an appointment in the honourable corps of spies and eavesdroppers employed by the government" (82.733).[40] Despite the fact that the 'Prentice Knights and the Protestant Association are no more, there remains a place in the world for secretive practices, and thus a continuing suggestion that the binary opposition between rich and poor, between the government and the governed may not be able to survive a full exposure of its secrets.

This fuller exposure of secretive practices would come from a rising member of Parliament, Benjamin Disraeli, in the form of a political novel which, though "his least typical work" (O'Kell, "Two Nations," 211–12),[41] is also his most enduring fictional text. In fact, *Sybil, or, The Two Nations* suffers somewhat from its own enduring popularity, or at least the enduring popularity of its subtitle. This subtitle, "The Two Nations," and the doctrine that it represents have come to dominate present perceptions of Disraeli's *Sybil*. The novel's theory of social division is first proposed to the novel's hero, Charles Egremont, in the ruins of Marney Abbey:

> "Two nations; between whom there is no intercourse and no sympathy; who are as ignorant of each other's habits, thoughts, and feelings, as if they were dwellers in different zones, or inhabitants of different planets; who are formed by a different breeding, are fed by different food, are ordered by different manners, and are not governed by the same laws."
> "You speak of—" said Egremont, hesitatingly.
> "THE RICH AND THE POOR." (II.5.65–66)[42]

From the moment of *Sybil*'s publication on 8 May 1845, critics have fastened on this succinct explanation of the condition of England, making it independent of and larger than the novel in which it first appears.

In the nineteenth century, Disraeli's image of the divided nation became a powerful metaphor for those seeking to reform English society. The Reverend A. Hume drew on the two nations doctrine, for example, when he lamented in *Conditions of Liverpool, Religious and Social* (1858), "It is altogether an anomaly, and a crying evil, in a christian land, that two communities whose members dwell within sound of the same bells and under the same rule of the same chief magistrate, should in many respects be practically as wide apart as if they resided in two separate quarters of the globe" (qtd. Susan Williams 3). Similarly, Deborah Epstein Nord has demonstrated that many reform-minded "urban explorers" combined Disraeli's two nations image with the kind of global difference suggested by Hume and "developed the habit of comparing the English inhabitants of Victorian slums to Aborigines, South Sea Islanders and, most frequently, to African tribes" (118). As Nord's argument makes clear, the nineteenth-century reformist urge to appropriate the "Two Nations" doctrine from *Sybil* in order to generate sympathy for the poor could also be used to make the poor appear wholly other, and thus unsuited for meaningful participation in society. Unfortunately, many twentieth-century readers have followed in this same tradition, remembering *Sybil* mainly for its subtitle and thus unfairly aligning it, however unintentionally, with uncritical class prejudice.[43]

However, as Robert O'Kell points out, the concept of the "two nations" is finally rejected by Egremont as a false doctrine that sustains class-based and religious prej-

udice (214). Though O'Kell is concerned mainly with how the "Two Nations" doctrine sustains Sybil's prejudice, his point may be expanded in order to explain the effects of a number of characters' (and readers') firm belief in societal binarism. Morley's own prejudicial belief in the "Two Nations" doctrine finally prompts him to conspire with Bishop Hatton to assault Mowbray Castle (V.11), where he is shot and killed by a division of yeomanry led by Egremont. What Egremont and the reader come to learn is that the "Two Nations" doctrine is insufficient to explain what Brantlinger calls the complex "diversity of the class system," which in England is filled with spuriously titled aristocrats like the Marneys and the Firebraces, latent working-class nobility like the Gerards, independent but morally flawed mechanics like Bishop Hatton and the Hellcats, and equally flawed masters like Diggs (Brantlinger, "Tory-Radicalism," 17).[44]

These characters complicate the fallaciously simple binary opposition between the rich and the poor in two ways simultaneously. At the level of fact, the novel leaves no doubts about their moral and social worth. Lord Marney has as little compassion for his grossly underpaid tenants as, being the descendant of "a confidential domestic of one of the favourites of Henry VIII" (I.3.9), he does for legitimate claims to a noble title. By contrast, though one of the leaders of moral force Chartism, Walter Gerard is descended from dispossessed Saxon nobility. Other working men do not share Gerard's latent nobility, however; Bishop Hatton, for example, is described by Stephen Morley as "a clear brain and a bold spirit; you have no scruples, which indeed are generally the creatures of perplexity rather than of principle'" (V.11.343). These "scruples" that Hatton lacks should be taken as roughly equivalent to the German *Sitten,* the fabric of custom that healthfully holds society together. Lacking this crucial component of cultural regulation makes Hatton capable of abusing his apprentices, assaulting the Trafford factory and leading the Plug Riots. These and the novel's other cast of characters are then juxtaposed throughout the text, adding to the confusion of any simple binary division of England by their very incongruousness. This technique of juxtaposition has been identified by Daniel Schwarz as "Disraeli's principle mode of rhetorical argument," occurring at the level of character and scene to construct meaning through opposition ("Art and Argument," 24).[45]

Undoubtedly the critic to get the most mileage from this mode of rhetorical argument is Catherine Gallagher, who, in *The Industrial Reformation of English Fiction,* offers the most cogent and theoretically sophisticated analysis of *Sybil* in print. Arguing that Disraeli's task in *Sybil* is "to legitimize one kind of representation through opposition while delegitimizing another" (203), or to establish "an identity of interests" between the aristocracy and the poor while discrediting "a new usurping oligarchy of aristocratic families" whose claims to the peerage rest on spurious grounds (202,

203), Gallagher concludes that "the novel ultimately legitimizes both" (203). In other words, *Sybil* attempts to proffer a theory of political representation—Tory Democracy—but fails because of its own energetic efforts to discredit the novel's aristocracy through ironic representation.

This theory of Tory Democracy rests in part on a complex binary opposition between the rich and the poor that at once firmly differentiates between them while asserting that their extreme difference aligns their political interests. However, as Gallagher notes, the "binary structure of the book finally impresses us . . . not with the differences between the classes, but with their similarities," since in "*Sybil* both typical aristocrats and workers are not so much representatives of their own class as ironic representatives of the opposite class" (203). She demonstrates this similarity through a close comparative reading of the abruptly juxtaposed dinners of Dandy Mick and Devilsdust at the Temple of the Muses, a working-class club (II.10), and of the de Mowbray party at de Mowbray's country house (II.11) (Gallagher, *Industrial Reformation of English Fiction,* 203–4). After suggesting but not analyzing a number of other parallel scenes, including "A Parliamentary division . . . followed by a trade union initiation" (204), Gallagher concludes that

> All of these and many other passages direct our attention to the underlying ways in which the classes indicate one another. This ironic form of representation through opposition, then, is morphologically similar to Disraeli's wished-for political system. . . . According to Tory Democracy, however, representation through opposition should bring out the best in both classes. . . . The novel's ironic representations, on the other hand, bring out the worst in both classes: their common pretension, selfishness, and ignorance.
>
> Despite its structural similarity to Disraeli's political ideal, therefore, irony is not a means of infusing facts with values in *Sybil;* rather, it is a means of devaluing what should be significant facts. (205)

In other words, the ironic similarities between the two nations produces a breakdown of signification in which the "fact" of aristocratic social standing can no longer serve as a guarantee of noble "value." Gallagher concentrates on this gap between the "aristocratic signifier and its signified" in order to reveal Disraeli's underlying vision of history and the subsequent collapse of his ideal of political representation through literary irony (205).[46]

However, this breakdown of signification can also be traced through Gallagher's neglected parallel between a Parliamentary division and Dandy Mick's trade union initiation in order to demonstrate the degree to which Disraeli's ironic representation of the collapse of social binaries depends on the figure of the secret society.

This figure is most overtly invoked by Dandy Mick's initiation into a secret trade union. Brought by his friend, Devilsdust, to a seemingly deserted warehouse in a suburb of Mowbray, Mick is confronted by "two forms which he hoped were human" (IV.4.218). Efficiently subduing him and bandaging his eyes, these "two awful sentries" lead him through a maze of rooms until he is "in the presence of the SEVEN" (IV.4.218–19). These SEVEN turn out to be the executive committee of a local trade union. They preside over a series of denunciations of both workers and masters for actions ranging from accepting only piece work—the practice of being paid by the task rather than by the hour—to firing workers because of their membership in the union. Once the denunciations are completed, the SEVEN then lead the union members in a prayer and in singing the "Hymn of Labour."

After these preliminary matters, Mick's eyes are uncovered, revealing to him and to the reader the spectacle of a trade union initiation. The walls of the room are hung with black cloth, and at an elevated table sit "seven persons in surplices and masked, the president on a loftier seat; above which, on a pedestal, was a skeleton complete" (IV.4.220). Guarding the skeleton and Mick are four disguised men armed with drawn swords and battle-axes, and sitting on the table is a bible. In the presence of these ritual forms, Mick is then sworn into the union on the following oath:

> Do you voluntarily swear in the presence of Almighty God and before these witnesses, that you will execute with zeal and alacrity, so far as in you lies, every task and injunction that the majority of your brethren, testified by the mandate of this grand committee, shall impose upon you, in furtherance of our common welfare, of which they are the sole judges; such as the chastisement of Nobs, the assassination of oppressive and tyrannical masters, or the demolition of all mills, works and shops that shall be deemed incorrigible? (IV.4.221)

This oath and the ritual surrounding it should look familiar since, as Brantlinger points out, "The oath which Dandy Mick takes is that which the Glasgow spinners were accused of using. Disraeli gives it to us verbatim, and the rest of the details of union ritual come from the evidence taken by the Committee on Combinations" ("The Case," 39).[47]

However, the union oath and ritual also bear a certain similarity to something much closer to hand: Disraeli's description in the previous chapter of a Parliamentary division. This description is necessarily sketchy, since "The mysteries of the Lobby are only for the initiated" (IV.3.211), but the reader is permitted to see the prelude to the division. Foreshadowing the perspective of the blindfolded Dandy Mick, the chapter begins with a disembodied voice announcing "'STRANGERS must withdraw'" (IV.3.210), followed by the overheard exchange

of a pair of insiders who talk of the mysterious practice of "pairing," which seems to mean leaving in pairs before being forced to vote.[48] While the division bell continues ringing, peers, diplomatists and members rush about in apparent confusion, and then, "The doors were locked" (IV.3.211), effectively removing from the uninitiated view the internal proceedings of Parliament. As the novel had earlier remarked, "the obscure majority, who, under our present constitution, are destined to govern England, are as secret as a Venetian conclave" (I.6.37).

One might also say "as secret as a trade union meeting," given the proximity of this scene to Dandy Mick's entry into the initiated and the novel's penchant for rhetorical argument through juxtaposition. In fact, this tendency toward conspiratorial secrecy seems to be the crux of the narrative's representation of the unrepresentability of the Parliamentary division.[49] Just like trade unions, Parliament can be described using the figure of the secret society. Of course, the irony of this representation of Parliamentary secrecy is that it comes from an initiate—Disraeli had been elected to the House of Commons in 1837—one who could show the inner workings if he so chooses, but who instead decides to preserve the division between outsiders and initiates that he critiques. In many ways, this final assertion of his own privileged position as an insider cements the relationship between "the SEVEN" and the House of Commons better than any exposure could have done by embodying the analogous secretive practices that make the authority of both groups possible.

III. Conclusions

Together, the Trial, *Barnaby Rudge* and *Sybil* demonstrate the inherent instability of any attempt to demonize trade unions and thereby deny the working classes democratic representation by evoking the figure of the secret society. In the Trial, the supposedly clear relation between the jury's verdict and the truth of the case is not adhered to by the judges, who attempt to recast the spinners and trade unions more generally as un-English others unfit for full citizenship by locating them within a rhetoric of conspiracy. This strategy is further reinforced by the weight of a Parliamentary Report and of Carlyle's allusions in *Chartism* to Indian Thuggee. However, the prominence accorded to secretive practices in this negative definition of Englishness always has the potential to work in reverse. Dickens's *Barnaby Rudge* shows how secretive practices are central not only to trade unions, but also to more upper-class institutions like the Protestant Association, and possibly even the government's attempts to maintain a network of social observation. *Sybil* follows this initial insight with the implication that the Parliamentary division between outsiders and initiates might also bear some similarity to trade unions' practices of secrecy. The result of all this

attention is that the attempted application of the figure of the secret society, and the attendant emphasis on secrecy as the essence of meaning, backfires as English institutions at all levels can be shown to employ secretive practices.

That this result was always already present in the figure of the secret society seems evident from the degree to which both Dickens and Disraeli continue to function within the structure of feeling of the trial. Neither seriously questions that trade unions employ secretive practices, as their mutual reliance on the Committee Report as reprinted in *The Annual Register* for 1838 makes evident. Both also rely on the intellectual construction of social binaries fostered by the trial to construct their texts: Dickens's characteristic motif of doubling and Disraeli's mode of argument-by-juxtaposition. Even the eventual implications of their fictions reproduce two observations that went largely unexamined at the time of the trial. Both the *Tait's* article, "The Trial of the Glasgow Spinners," and the Parliamentary speech given by Daniel O'Connell, suggest that combinations may be more widespread than popular prejudice allowed, that the House of Lords, the House of Commons, and the Temple Bar might all be legitimately seen as trades' unions of the more well-to-do, making the spinners union not a dangerously un-English other, but a disturbingly familiar and very "English" mirrored self.

Ironically, neither Dickens nor Disraeli would have been entirely comfortable with these implications of their own texts. Middle-class liberalism and Tory Democracy were both grounded in some ways on a definition of Englishness that included a deep distrust of secretive practices, especially among the working classes. Despite their authors' political biases, however, the novels finally undermine the basis for this definition of Englishness altogether by emptying the figure of the secret society of its particularizing significance. If a supposedly "English" institution like Parliament is also "un-English" by virtue of its reliance on practices of secrecy, then attempting to cast trade unions as dangerous others by labeling them secret societies seems ironically counter-hegemonic. In fact, insisting upon the binary opposition between secret and open societies makes the Thugs appear every bit as English as the House of Commons.

3

Popish Plots: Catholic Emancipation, Tractarian Reserve, and "Papal Aggression"

Concentrating too exclusively on the common preoccupation with trade unionism in both *Barnaby Rudge* and *Sybil* risks obscuring the novels' other shared topos of English Catholicism. As Dickens reminds the reader in his Preface to *Barnaby Rudge,* he chose for the novel's historical background "the 'No Popery' riots of Seventeen Hundred and Eighty," a subject that he believed could "teach a good lesson" by showing how "what we falsely call a religious cry is easily raised by men who have no religion" (40).[1] Such a lesson would have had a two-fold historical resonance in 1841, since, as Dyson perceptively notes, the Catholic Relief Act and the Oxford Movement were "exciting new and widespread anti-clericism" (67). This common background of Catholic emancipation and Tractarianism also informs Disraeli's use of religious motifs, a subject that O'Kell calls "the least-satisfactorily discussed aspect of *Sybil*" (216).[2] In fact, the novel is virtually overflowing with religious references: the central conflict is introduced among the ruined remains of Marney abbey, with Sybil herself providing Egremont with a kind of monastic epiphany when she appears, clad "in the habit of a Religious," singing "the evening hymn to the Virgin" in "tones of almost supernatural sweetness" (II.5.66); this first epiphanic encounter leads Egremont into recurrent musings on the "Holy Church," itself embodied by Aubrey St. Lys, the vicar of Mowbray, whose name is homophonetically "sin-less"; the Hatton brothers are ironically called "Baptist" and "Bishop" respectively; and the benevolent Catholic factory owner, Mr. Trafford, has endowed a church with a full-time curate to minister to his almost-monastic laborers (III.8.182).

Moreover, English Catholicism appears intermittently in both novels represented

by the same language of conspiracy applied to trade unions. We have already seen Dickens attribute the popularity of the Protestant Association to its mantle of secrecy and its "whispers of a confederacy among the Popish powers to degrade and enslave England, establish an inquisition in London, and turn the pens of Smithfield market into stakes and cauldrons" (37.347–48). Fears of similar Popish plots also appear in *Sybil.* Responding to a speech by St. Lys on "the efficacy of forms and ceremonies," Egremont cautions him, "The people of this country associate them with an enthralling superstition and a foreign dominion" (II.12.111). Both of these applications of a rhetoric of conspiracy to English Catholicism are carefully undermined by Dickens and Disraeli: the Protestant Association's no-Popery cry is shown to be founded on personal animosity and greed; and any lingering fears of foreign dominion are immediately countered by St. Lys's genealogical account of forms and ceremonies. However, the fact that both authors felt the need to raise and refute this characterization of Catholicism indicates both a widespread popular prejudice and a potential point of connection between trade unionism and the "Romish Church."

Protestant England's fears of the "Romish Church" were particularly topical at the time both novels were written. Dyson's observation on the general public's reaction to Catholic emancipation in 1829 and to Tractarianism several years later can actually be applied more specifically. It is no accident that the less-than-sympathetic representation of Lord Gordon's Protestant Association in *Barnaby Rudge* appears only six years after that same organization was revived in response to the Catholic Relief Act. In addition, the novel's cries of "No Popery!" echo those directed not only at English Catholics but also at the Oxford Movement, which had excited popular anti-Catholic feelings in 1838 by the publication of Isaac Williams's *Tract 80* and *Tract 87,* "On Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge." *Sybil* similarly arrives in a year charged by John Henry Newman's public conversion to Roman Catholicism and by Parliamentary debate over increasing the government endowment of Maynooth College, the principle location for the training of Catholic priests in Britain.[3] To many Victorians, even those sympathetic to the Roman Catholic cause, the government's final decision to continue funding Maynooth would look particularly ill-considered in light of the public outcry caused by the restoration of the Catholic hierarchy in England in 1850. The effect of these events is well summarized by Walter Arnstein, who writes,

> In the later eighteenth century, and even in the early nineteenth, it had come to seem a waste of time for Anglican clergymen to preach on the evils of popery or to enter into theological debate with Catholic prelates. The Oxford movement and the Catholic revival quickly altered the situation. The mid-Victorian "ultra-Protestant" was far more likely to be fearful than confident, far more likely to suspect than to exalt the religious integrity of his clerical and political leaders.[4]

The apparent complicity of Protestant MPs in the resurgence of "popery" brought about by Catholic emancipation and the Maynooth Grant made their religious convictions suspect, and the growth of English Catholicism at Oxford also rendered traditional religious leaders untrustworthy. For Arnstein's "ultra-Protestant," England had always been under "popish" attack from without, but events in the nineteenth century began to suggest collusion from within as well. Such imputations of a lack of integrity among Protestant leaders and English Roman Catholics were often articulated by means of accusations of conspiracy and the invocation of the figure of the secret society.

The period between Catholic emancipation and the restoration of the Catholic hierarchy provides particularly fertile ground for numerous political invocations of the figure of the secret society designed to prevent English Catholics from achieving social and political equality. Its three most productive sites of analysis, Catholic emancipation, the two *Tracts* on reserve, and the restoration of the hierarchy, indicate not only the increasing civil authority enjoyed by Roman and Anglo-Catholics, but also the extent to which that authority met with public hostility framed by accusations of "Popish" plots supposedly at work in Protestant England.[5] The strategies employed to promulgate these accusations and the unusual alliances they fostered among normally divergent segments of British society bear a close resemblance to the rhetoric of conspiracy directed at the Glasgow spinners and the unity such rhetoric fostered among Tories and Whigs. In fact, one need look no further than the Report of the Select Committee on Combinations, with its account of the "religious character" of trade union initiations—including "white surplices," "prayers and hymns," and "certain mystic rhymes," all decidedly Catholic references—to see exactly how easy it could be to collapse anti-unionism and anti-Catholicism. In addition, fears of divided loyalties generated by the practice of oath-taking and the evocation of past atrocities figure prominently in both cases. Also, British Catholics, who were mostly working-class Irish laborers, did not fit the conventional definition of Englishness as middle-class and Protestant and thereby challenged the right of these groups to serve as society's political guardians. In order to reestablish this hegemonic right, Tory and Whig periodicals joined Establishment clergy and Dissenting ministers, Parliamentary aristocrats and working-class placardists to strategically deploy the figure of the secret society against English Catholics. Specifically, both Roman and Anglo-Catholics were linked with the Jesuits by their public critics in an effort to demonstrate their natural unfitness for "open" English democracy.

However, as with the charges of Thuggism made against trade unions, accusations of Jesuitism remained vulnerable to factual scrutiny and susceptible to ideological reversal by specific agents from all sides of the Catholic question. Vehement anti-Catholics tended to accuse Roman and Anglo-Catholics alike of Jesuitism even as

they relied on methods of argument that strongly pro-Catholic figures were quick to label Jesuitical. Those more ambivalent towards Roman Catholicism but still committed to an ideal of catholicity were likewise susceptible to both sides' charges of Jesuitical equivocation. In addition, Catholic apologists often sought to undermine the political authority of the figure of Jesuitism by shifting the debate to more aesthetic and spiritual grounds. Once Roman and Anglo-Catholicism took on extra-political qualities, it not only ceased to threaten the state, but also took on a much more attractive character. In other words, even though any invocation of the figure of Jesuitism was supposed to uphold a definition of national citizenship grounded in binary opposition between English Protestants and Roman Catholics, the multitude of competing invocations and their extra-political dimensions made the two sides practically indistinguishable. In this way, the ongoing conflict over Catholicism echoes the debate over trade unionism that surrounds the spinners' trial; in both cases, it is the uncomfortable familiarity of the supposed conspirators that both prompts and undercuts their denunciation.

I. Catholic Emancipation

For those of us no longer within the structure of feeling of the early nineteenth century, it may be somewhat surprising that English Roman Catholics could have excited such a widespread reaction among British Protestants. Never accounting for even ten percent of the total population of England and disunited under the inefficient spiritual authority of four Vicars Apostolic, Roman Catholics nevertheless aroused widespread hostility and anxiety over the constitutional stability of Britain.[6] Wendy Hinde explains that for many Protestants the "problem with the Roman Catholics was that their religion was believed to imply a degree of intolerance, disloyalty—or at least divided loyalty—and dissimulation that in the eyes of many honest Britons made them quite unfit to enjoy the privileges of full citizenship" (3). However, Protestant distrust of their Catholic fellow-citizens was also inadvertently generated by the latter's attempt to withdraw from public controversy in the aftermath of the Gordon Riots. This withdrawal made Catholics the target of Protestant charges of deliberate secrecy and encouraged the already-popular suspicion that Catholics had superstitious practices that they wanted to hide.[7] History also furnished numerous, if distant, examples that Roman Catholics could not be trusted, among them the rule of "Bloody" Mary, the Jesuit mission under Elizabeth I, the Jacobite rebellion, and the gunpowder plot, all of which were treated as highly relevant to the present day.[8] As with the Glasgow spinners, then, contemporary Roman Catholics were effectively tried and convicted in the public mind on the basis of past conspiracies.[9]

However, probably the most decisive factor in the escalation of anti-Catholicism in the nineteenth century was the Act of Union with Ireland in 1800. In the words of Walter Arnstein, "Roman Catholicism, as threat or promise, loomed larger in the minds of Victorian Englishmen than the actual number of Roman Catholics might have warranted because Englishmen were likely to view the phenomenon not in the context of England but in that of the entire United Kingdom" (52). In fact, once Roman Catholicism was examined in light of all of Britain, matters looked considerably more distressing. The 6,000,000 Irish Roman Catholics increased the percentage of Roman Catholics in the kingdom to thirty percent, and the Irish Catholics were far better organized than their English co-religionists. Not only did they enjoy a comprehensive parish structure, complete with priests and bishops who answered directly to Rome, but from 1823 onwards they also had O'Connell's Catholic Association. Working in concert, the priests and the Catholic Association wielded considerable power in Ireland: enough to suppress violent crime, to call up public demonstrations of 5,000 men seemingly in an instant, to influence the local election of Members of Parliament, and to convince Robert Peel and others that a real possibility of revolution existed on the other side of the Irish Sea.[10]

Together, historical precedent, revolutionary potential, divided allegiance, and suspicious secretiveness formed the basis of the debate over Catholic emancipation in 1828 and 1829.[11] More vocal in its evocation of history than most, *Blackwood's* unashamedly reminded its readers "that Elizabeth . . . after a long and patient endurance of Popish plots for her assassination, for insurrection, and invasion, was at length compelled to make root and branch-work with the Papists, after a fashion consistent with the vigour of her character," implying that Elizabeth's situation and her solution were still analogous enough to the present to be practicable ("Brief Remarks," 88–89). Elizabeth's relevance to the 1820s was mainly determined by the presence of Ireland in the debate, a presence that the same article describes as "rather hard on the English Roman Catholics . . . because the English Roman Catholics are a much more respectable, better-behaved class of subjects . . . and therefore more deserving of being favourably regarded" (87). The "mass" in Ireland, on the other hand, is described as "turbulent," largely because "a few men are allowed to exercise, without control or punishment, their foolish and wicked plans, for the disturbance of the people" (90). Such transparent references to the Catholic Association could perform meaningful political work in at least three ways at once. As here, the Catholic Association could serve as an easy means of representing those elements of the Irish people seeking to undermine the British government and thereby proving the Catholics unworthy of full citizenship. A future *Blackwood's* article, however, would also use the Catholic Association as a sign that the dangers of revolution in Ireland were slight, since only a small percentage of Irish subjects were active mem-

bers, thereby arguing that emancipation was not a necessary step ("Ireland, and the Catholic Question"). Finally, supporters of emancipation like Mr. Goulburn, the chancellor of the Exchequer, evoked the "combination" and "organization" of the Catholic Association as signs that emancipation was the only way to preserve the authority of the Established Church.[12] This last mode of reasoning was in the minority, however, and evocations of the Catholic Association led most often to spirited and ominous advocacy for all "measures necessary for rendering the Catholics peaceable and obedient subjects" ("Ireland, and the Catholic Question," 440).[13]

That Catholics threatened to behave other than peaceably and obediently was thought by some to be due to their divided allegiance between the Crown and the Pope. According to the Anglican Archbishop of Armagh, "The Roman Catholic priesthood must ever stand alone. It had set the indelible mark of separation on its forehead, by its unnatural, though politic restrictions,—by its claim to exclusive pre-eminence,—and by its dangerous and unconstitutional connection with a foreign state" (*The Annual Register, 1829,* 73). Likewise, three other MPs maintained that no "rational man could expect, that the Catholics, and Catholic priesthood, would remain satisfied even with what was now given. The re-establishment of their church was not only their interest; if they were Catholics, it was their sacred duty, an obligation far more holy than that of battling for a civil franchise, which, in truth, would be chiefly valuable only as an instrument by which to regain religious preponderance" (*The Annual Register, 1829,* 29).

At the heart of this portion of the debate lay an inability to distinguish between spiritual and civil allegiance. Once one recognized that Roman Catholicism might have more than just a political valence, opposition to emancipation on constitutional grounds became difficult to maintain: "The Catholics of Great Britain recognize an ecclesiastical jurisdiction vested in a foreigner, because their Pope happens to be the Pope of Rome, and not the Pope of Canterbury. But there is no proof that they will ever obey their Pope in opposition to their civil interests" ("Catholic Question," 4).[14] Furthermore, the same article maintained, "Unless it can be shown, first, that there is any danger of the Catholics . . . being put upon designs incompatible with the safety of the community, by the ecclesiastical superiors they chuse to make for themselves,—and, secondly, that their numbers give them any chance of accomplishing such designs if they possessed them,—the depriving them of the enjoyment of equal rights on pretence of these peculiarities, is a cruel *non sequitur*" ("Catholic Question," 13). Such a violation of the basic premises of logic was precisely the ground on which one reviewer remarked, "The mere mention of the word Popery, it was known, had been sufficient, any time these hundred years, to deprive a considerable portion of Englishmen of the perfect use of their understanding" ("The Last of the Catholic Question," 225).

A considerable portion of Englishmen might have rejoined that their understanding was so sorely taxed because of the habitual secrecy and under-handedness of the Catholics and their supporters. As one reviewer put it, "The Roman Catholic superstition hangs, at its clearest, like a day of dense fog—at its darkest, like a night of black clouds—over the reason and the conscience" ("Substance of Sir Robert Inglis's Two Speeches," 812). Even Sir Robert Peel seemed to admit that at one time, at least, such charges of secrecy were well-founded: "[T]he Catholics were never excluded, at any time, because of their religious creed; they were excluded for a supposed deficiency of civil worth; and the religious test was applied to them, not to detect the worship of saints, or any other tenet of their religion, but as a test to discover whether they were Roman Catholics. It was a test to discover the bad, intriguing subject, not the religionist." However, he also believed that such tests of exclusion to ferret out the "bad intriguing subject" were no longer necessary and that, therefore, "when the exclusion was deemed unnecessary, the test of exclusion might be dispensed with" (*The Annual Register, 1829,* 57). Unfortunately for Peel and his fellow-Minister, the Duke of Wellington, their support of emancipation brought similar charges of improper secrecy; both were accused of disingenuousness and of improperly asserting their ministerial influence.[15] All of this illicit secrecy promulgated a persistent belief that Catholic emancipation meant a fatal "breaking up" of the Constitution of 1688. Once again, *Blackwood's* provides the clearest articulation of this final argument against emancipation:

> If, therefore, the "detested measure" be successful, our government of checks and balances will be in essence totally destroyed. The Catholics, with their Anti-Church, Anti-English allies, will hold the House of Commons and the Cabinet; the Crown and the House of Lords will be their passive instruments, and their power will be absolute. They will in their own favour abolish law after law in utter defiance of the country, precisely as the present Ministers are now doing. Religious apostacy will be as prevalent among public men, as political apostacy is at present. One robbery upon another will be heaped on the Church—one wrong upon another will be heaped on the Protestants—one destruction upon another will be heaped on Protestant rights,—until at last the day of long-suffering will end in CIVIL WAR. ("The 'Breaking in Upon the Constitution of 1688,'" 523)[16]

By the time this apocalyptic prophesy made it to print in April, 1829, the Catholic Emancipation Act was all but law.

However, the Act did offer three "securities" to those who felt less than enthusiastic about its passage.[17] Section XII barred Roman Catholics from serving as "Guardians and Justices of the United Kingdom" and from holding the offices of "Lord

High Chancellor, Lord Keeper or Lord Commissioner of the Great Seal of Great Britain or Ireland; or the office of Lord Lieutenant, or Lord Deputy, or other Chief Governor or Governors of Ireland; or His Majesty's High Commissioner to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland." These offices were specifically excluded in order to prevent a Roman Catholic from gaining direct control over the Established Church. However, it is important to note that a Roman Catholic could now serve as a Member of Parliament, and even theoretically as Prime Minister, though this last possibility remained highly unlikely given the obvious reluctance with which many Members had voted in favor of the bill.

The Act's main security came in the form of a denominationally specific oath to be taken by Roman Catholics upon entering either House of Parliament. Prior to the Act, all MPs were required to subscribe to an oath of allegiance, an oath of abjuration that denied the rights of any Stuart to the throne, a declaration against the doctrine of transubstantiation, and the following oath of supremacy:

> I, A. B., do swear that I do from my heart detest and abjure as impious and heretical that damnable doctrine and position, that Princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope or any authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or any other whatsoever; and I do declare that no foreign prince, prelate, state or potentate hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence or authority, Ecclesiastical or Spiritual, within this realm.[18]

Realizing that both the doctrine against transubstantiation and the latter part of the oath of supremacy denying the ecclesiastical authority of the Pope would be inappropriate for Roman Catholics, the writers of the Act abolished the declaration against transubstantiation altogether and introduced in section II the following alternative oath:

> I, A. B., do sincerely promise and swear, that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to his majesty king George the fourth, and will defend him to the utmost of my power against all conspiracies and attempts whatever . . . and I will do my utmost endeavour to disclose and make known to his majesty, his heirs and successors, all treasons and traitorous conspiracies which may be formed against him or them . . . and I do further declare, that it is not an article of my faith, and that I do renounce, reject, and abjure the opinion, that princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, or any other authority of the see of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or by any person whatsoever: and I do declare, that I do not believe that the Pope of Rome, or any other foreign prince, prelate, person, state, or potentate, hath or ought to have any temporal or civil jurisdiction,

> power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm . . . and I do hereby disclaim, disavow and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present church establishment . . . and I do solemnly swear, that I will never exercise any privilege to which I am or may become entitled, to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant government in the united kingdom: and I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain ordinary sense of the words of this oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever. So help me God.[19]

When juxtaposed with its Protestant counterpart, the oath for Roman Catholics contains a number of elements that strikingly illustrate the degree to which the figure of the secret society enters into the Catholic Question. First while by virtue of their three separate oaths some Protestants might be assumed capable of holding conflicting opinions regarding royal supremacy, papal authority and the Stuart Pretender, Roman Catholics were made to effectively admit that their religion made them politically suspect on all three grounds unless they swore otherwise. In other words, Protestants were more than just their religion, but Roman Catholics were not. Second, while the Protestant oath is, for a legal document, fairly simple and straightforward, the Roman Catholic oath is overrun by clauses, near-repetitions and excessive verbiage, implying a certain amount of anxiety over the supposed tendency of Catholics to evade, equivocate, or reserve some part of the truth by twisting words outside of their "plain ordinary sense." Third, this anxiety reaches extreme levels in the almost paranoid requirement that Roman Catholics abjure *five times* any desire to participate in, by action or by silence, a conspiracy against the sovereignty of Britain. Such obvious safeguarding suggests that fears of a Catholic conspiracy like those voiced in the April 1829 issue of *Blackwood's* exerted a powerful influence even over supporters of Catholic emancipation.

Nowhere is the influence of conspiracy fears more readily translated into a direct evocation of the figure of the secret society than in the final security offered in the Act. Sections XXVI, XXVIII, XXIX, XXXIII, and XXXIV place severe limitations on "Religious Orders, Communities, or Societies of the Church of Rome," all of which were barred from exercising "any of the Rites or Ceremonies of the Roman Catholic Religion" or wearing religious habits in public, bringing in foreign members, and inducting new members by means of "any Oath, Vow, or Engagement," and all of which were required to register all present members with the government within six months of the passage of the Act.[20] As the language of the Act makes clear, these restrictions were meant primarily to effect "the gradual Suppression and final Prohibition" of the Society of Jesus in England. Indeed, the Jesuits were per-

ceived as the Catholic secret society par excellence, the authors of all past, present and future Popish plots against the crown.

Such a view of the Jesuits prevailed among those on both sides of the Catholic Question. Even though he rejected many of the proposed securities offered by previous bills, Peel gave unqualified assent to the anti-religious orders clause, which he explained "was meant to provide against the entrance into this country of a class of men, against whom other countries had set their faces, and who hitherto, therefore, had resorted to this; he meant the order of Jesuits" (*The Annual Register, 1829,* 26). As on the subjects of revolution in Ireland and secretive Catholic practices, *Blackwood's* was most vituperative towards the Jesuits:

> If the Jesuits think good to advance the money, they may, by purchase, soon introduce a large number of Catholic freemen into every borough . . . constantly themselves elect both the members for sundry small boroughs . . . [and] return half the members in the shape of "Third Men," of many large boroughs.
>
> . . . We do not know what the Society of Jesuits will do, but we know what it will be in its power to do . . . it may effectively govern the majority in the House of Commons. ("The 'Breaking in Upon the Constitution of 1688,'" 521)

Although this level of rhetoric was extreme, the feelings it expressed about the Society of Jesus—often, as here, slightingly referred to as the Society of Jesuits—were extraordinarily prevalent while the act was under deliberation.[21] In the "Chronicle" section of *The Annual Register, 1829,* an incident of public disturbance provides a glimpse of just how public anti-Jesuit sentiment was at this time. On 4 February constables arrested two men for pasting "seditious placards" that referred to a "Jesuit's powder . . . which produced dizziness in the head and such lethargic affections as rendered them [Parliament] incapable of judging" and that warned, "People of England! Protestants of England! Your churches, your Bible, your laws, and your liberties, free-born Englishmen, will become the willing slaves of a corrupt religion and a foreign prince" as a result of the action of this Jesuit powder on Parliament (29–30).

Both *Blackwood's* and the authors of the "seditious placard," and to a lesser extent Peel, drew from and participated in a long-standing cultural tradition of anti-Jesuitism in England. This tradition is voluminously recorded in *The Oxford English Dictionary,* which gives as its second definition of Jesuit, "A dissembling person; a prevaricator" and offers examples of this usage dating back to 1640 in England. Similarly, adjectives derived from Jesuit, like Jesuitical and Jesuitic had, since 1613, meant "Having the character ascribed to the Jesuits; deceitful, dissembling; practising equivocation, prevarication, or mental reservation of truth. Often used in sense 'hair-splitting,' keenly analytical." This rich linguistic heritage of the Jesuits was accompanied by an

equally prolific literary tradition that, after the Jesuits were restored by papal bull *Sollicitudo omnium Ecclesiarum* on 7 August 1814, produced such titles as *A Brief Account of the Jesuits: With Historical Proofs in Support of It, Tending to Establish the Danger of the Revival of that Order to the World at Large, and to the United Kingdom in Particular* (1815), *The Abominations of the Jesuits Exposed* (1820), *The Jesuits Exposed* (1839), *Secret Instructions of the Jesuits* (1840), *Hidden Works of Darkness: or, The Doings of the Jesuits* (1846), *The Jesuit Conspiracy: the Secret Plan of the Order* (1848), and many others.[22]

According to this remarkably consistent literary tradition, which excelled at both taking the comments of a small number of Jesuit casuists out of context and anachronistically judging all Jesuits by these comments, "it would be difficult to fix upon any modification of crime which has not been palliated, if not justified, by members of the society of Jesus" (Evans, Modern Popery, 185). In England, especially, this tradition credited the Jesuits with treason, assassination, dissimulation, subversion of the faithful, and the attempted overthrow of the Protestant constitution of 1688.[23] As the extraordinarily conservative MP, Charles Newdegate, wrote in his *Glimpse of the Great Secret Society,* "The intrigues of the Jesuits and their attacks upon the form of government, which has existed in Great Britain since the Revolution of 1688, have been continuous" (lxxiv).[24] Their persistence was thought to be derived from a number of sources, including a fanatical and total devotion to the Pope, their penchant for secrecy,[25] and their methods of training. These training methods involved what Andrew Steinmetz, a former Jesuit novice, describes in *The Novitiate* as a self-conscious breakdown of familial ties (48, 229), the instillation of absolute obedience to one's superiors, and a constant process of surveillance of and among the novices. Concerning this "spy system" and how it differs from seemingly similar practices by English informers, Steinmetz writes, "It was a bitter thing this to comply with—I mean this spy system—but it was 'for the greater glory of God': what should not that motive induce us not to do? And yet Englishmen must find it a sticking pill. True, we have informers, but they are as much detested here as they were at Athens" (234). Steinmetz seems unaware that the main grounds for this differentiation are tautological. Jesuit surveillance is objectionable because it is performed in the name of the supposed "greater glory of God," the falseness of which is apparent in their fervently embraced need to watch one another all the time. On the other hand, the English employ informants in order to insure the security of the state, a motive whose worth can be judged by their reluctant acceptance of the practice. In other words, Steinmetz protests against the surveillance of novices because it is founded on false intents and undesirable results even as he uses this surveillance to prove that the intents and end results are false. What is most ironic about this distinction between the English use of informants and the Jesuit spy system is that it is based on a subtle difference of intention and an implicit justification of the means

by the end. Both of these methods of reasoning were accounted Jesuitical by nineteenth-century standards.

Jesuitism was seen as especially dangerous, however, because it produced individual Jesuits who could pass undetected among normal Englishmen. Steinmetz gives the following description of a proper Jesuit:

> Bold or submissive—firm as a rock, or pliant as a willow—the Jesuit must know his 'time for all things'—when a virtue must be possessed or feigned, or a vice absent or dissembled. Thus, *without,* he is a *Proteus* of wonderful versatility—*within,* always and for ever the same—*man of obedience*—fashioned and trained in heart and mind strongly to will, and promptly to act—and yet, if it should seem more expedient, content to bide his time! (5–6)

This contrast between the Jesuit without and the Jesuit within means that "Jesuits are invisible people, known by their effects only" (44). In other words, Jesuits do not conform to the standards of open, upright behavior that Adams argues were central to the definition of the English gentleman, but instead they live a double life, hiding their subversive agenda behind a facade of respectability.

This characterization of the Jesuits as an undetectable Catholic secret society serves at least three important functions for nineteenth-century anti-Catholicism. First, like the Lord Advocate's plea that discovering evidence against the spinners was made almost impossible by the very conspiratorial secrecy that he sought to establish, saying of the Jesuits that "by their outward man you cannot tell them" allowed Protestant opponents of Catholic emancipation to use the very lack of recent evidence of a Jesuit conspiracy to prove that such a conspiracy must exist (Steinmetz 370). Second, representing the Jesuits as undetectable meant that their numbers and political clout could be widely exaggerated in order to gain support for anti-Catholicism through fear. Third, this support could be generated whenever needed—whether during the debate over Catholic emancipation in the 1820s, the reaction to Tractarian reserve in the 1830s, or the response to so-called "papal aggression" in the 1850s. It is to the second of these events that we now turn.

II. Tractarian Reserve

Even though accusations of conspiracy, and specifically of Jesuitism, were mainly directed by anxious English Protestants at Roman Catholicism, the Oxford Movement also excited the same rhetoric of religious denunciation grounded in the figure of the secret society. Opponents of the Movement cited its emphasis on forms and sacramentalism and

its elevation of the clergy both inside and outside of the liturgy as evidence that it was seeking to create an elite priesthood capable of secretly governing Anglicanism from within. As Adams explains, this plan would make members of the Movement guilty of a "double duplicity" (86), since not only were they preaching false doctrine and thus subverting the Protestant Establishment, but they were doing so under the respectable guise of Oxford fellows and dons. Especially during moments of public controversy in the 1830s, this fear of duplicitousness could be translated into outright charges of conspiracy and even Jesuitism.

However, there remained two fundamental problems with attempting to discredit the Tractarians using the figure of Jesuitism. First, applying such anti-Roman Catholic rhetoric to powerful members of the Establishment—many of whom were staunch opponents of Popery and all of whom consistently maintained that their doctrine was taken from the Protestant *Book of Common Prayer*—required a significant elision of the very distinction between Protestantism and Popery that the figure was meant to uphold. In fact, a number of Tractarians cited such denominational "hair-splitting" as evidence for an anti-Tractarian and suspiciously Jesuitical conspiracy. Second, associating the Oxford Movement with what Adams refers to as "the sinister designs of a secret society" allowed its members to capitalize on the aesthetic and spiritual valuation of such formally secretive behavior (86); according to Adams, this very "aura of conspiracy seems to have been a part of the appeal of the Movement to many of its younger followers" (87). By shifting the terms of the debate out of the political register, Tractarians like Isaac Williams were able to make a virtue of the very secrecy with which the Movement was charged.

The first public controversy in which members of the Oxford Movement embroiled themselves concerned the Crown's appointment of Dr. Hampden as Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford University. Pusey and other members of the burgeoning Movement opposed the appointment on the grounds that Hampden's historical approach to theological discourse in general, and to the Thirty-Nine Articles in particular, betrayed Catholic leanings. They sought to block Hampden's candidacy first by an appeal to the Crown and then by placing the issue before a Convocation of the clergy. Ultimately, they were unsuccessful—the king rejected their appeal, and they were cleverly outmaneuvered by the proctors of the Convocation—but their opposition brought them a great deal of publicity, much of which evoked the figure of the secret society.[26]

Perhaps the most famous article on the subject was written by Dr. Thomas Arnold and published in the April, 1836 issue of the *Edinburgh Review*. Arnold's article, entitled "The Oxford Malignants and Dr. Hampden," retells the events of the Hampden controversy, using both the rhetoric of conspiracy surrounding trade unionism and that deployed against seventeenth-century Roman Catholics to represent the

Puseyites as suffering not from "*intellectual error*" but from "*moral wickedness*" (238). Arnold seems unconcerned with this mixing of rhetoric and collapse of chronology, readily characterizing the "Malignants" as both "unionists" and "the very Nonjurors and High Church clergy of King William's, and Anne's, and George the First's reign, reproduced with scarcely a shade of difference" (228, 234–35). Like the prosecution at the Glasgow spinners' trial, Arnold condemns the formation of a select committee among the Puseyites, as well as their apparently democratic leanings, both of which together he sees as the practice of factional intimidation:

> As a first step, they met in the common room of Corpus Christi College, and named a committee to conduct their business. The committee drew up a declaration, which was submitted to the whole body of conspirators, and then published, with a long list of names subscribed to it" (226). . . . A *vote,* they knew, might give them what they could never hope from a *verdict*. If Justice were to decide upon the case, they were sure to be disgracefully defeated; if Faction could be made the judge, they had a reasonable prospect of success. (229)

However, at the same time, Arnold also calls on the anti-Catholic rhetoric of the time when he describes these same men as contemporary Nonjurors. He continues in this anti-Catholic vein, casting the "High Church party of the Church of England—the party of the Oxford conspirators" as dedicated merely to preserving "fanaticism," "folly" and "virulence," as expressed by "A dress, a ritual, a name, a ceremony," without progressing in any way (235). Arnold concludes by labeling them as nothing more or less than a "heresy" (235).

Despite Arnold's righteous assurance, his conflation of political (anti-union) and spiritual (anti-Catholic) registers remains open to challenge from those on the other side of the debate. An exactly contemporary article in *Blackwood's* charged that Hampden's "promotion is the work of that powerful influence which has had all our late Administrations in the hollow of its hand . . . the same combination of Papistry and Jacobinism, which is hurrying the whole constitution, in church and state, hourly down a precipice" ("Oxford and Dr. Hampden," 433). Here, it is the Catholic faction in Parliament acting exactly as *Blackwood's* had predicted they would during the debate over emancipation. However, once again the presence of a recognized public body in the accusation leads to a collapse of political (anti-Jacobin) and spiritual (anti-Catholic) discourse similar not only to Arnold's, but also to the opposition to emancipation voiced in *Blackwood's* eight years earlier. The ease with which both sides of the Hampden controversy combined these two distinct registers under the rubric of conspiracy reveals a powerful Protestant anxiety over Catholics' increasing social and political equality in the wake of emancipation. That this anxiety is self-divided and even at cross purposes with England's

public commitment to democratic institutions is indicated by the immense chronological and political gaps that such accusations of Popish plots were meant to elide.

The broader community of popular writers largely agreed with Arnold that the actions of the Puseyites in the Hampden controversy smacked of Romanism. One writer, in fact, responded to the incident with the farcical *Pastoral Appeal from his Holiness the Pope to some Members of the University of Oxford,* which not only read evidence of Romanism in the *Tracts* already published, but also uncannily anticipated later denunciations of Williams's *Tracts* "On Reserve" by having the "Pope" urge upon the Tractarians the following practical advice:

> to study attentively, and to adopt for your own guidance the instructions which we have ever given to those faithful men whom we have employed to win over others to the one true faith: "we have always urged them not to expose their doctrines too openly to the public view; to be satisfied in the first instance that much ignorance should remain, and only to press truth gradually as the minds of men seemed prepared for its reception. . . . [T]hose around you have some misgivings that you are attached to what they call Popery. Do not awaken any such suspicions by avoidable imprudence. Rather be satisfied with a slow progress than run the risk of injuring the work in which you are engaged." (33)

The "faithful men" referred to are almost certainly the Jesuits, making this document a prescient foreshadowing of those works that would charge the Tractarians with Jesuitism in 1838.

Isaac Williams's two *Tracts* on reserve were made additionally vulnerable to charges of Jesuitism by historical events over which he had no control. The first of these, the posthumous publication of Richard Hurrell Froude's *Remains* early in 1838, excited widespread denunciation of the Oxford Movement because of a number of passages in which Froude, one of the leading figures in the Movement up to his death, appeared sympathetic to Roman Catholicism. At the same time, many contemporary conservative periodicals anxiously responded to the recent Catholic unrest in the British colony of Canada by "exposing" the increasing and dangerous power of Popery throughout the world. Articles like "The Progress of Popery" in *Blackwood's* and "Statistics of Popery in Great Britain and the Colonies" in the extremely anti-Catholic *Fraser's Magazine* pretended to present unbiased statistical evidence that "Popery, both at home and abroad, is in the possession of immense strength, and has been, and is now, marching forward with giant strides to its old ascendency" ("The Progress of Popery," 494). The extraordinarily reactionary article in *Fraser's* even occupied two successive issues and was accompanied by a map detailing the location of every Catholic church, school, training center, etc. in Great Britain. As the reviewer remarked, such publication

was necessary, because "The Jesuits . . . are now again called into action, and are allowed in a degenerate age to undermine, with impunity, and prosper without remark" (502). Accusations of Jesuitism thus enjoyed a high public prominence at precisely the same time that Williams offered his doctrine of reserve.

Even without these historical events, however, the doctrine of reserve had already met with suspicion when it first appeared in John Henry Newman's *History of the Arians* (1836). A lengthy review in the *Edinburgh Review* judged that "the upholding a secret instruction, and the need of the teaching of the church as a key to the collection of passages which relate to the mysteries of the gospels, looks extremely Popish" and "is no part of genuine Christianity" ("Newman's *History of the Arians,*" 65, 68). According to the reviewer, reserve runs counter to the spirit of the Reformation—which he aligns with the free exercise of reason—because it demands absolute irrational obedience, a distinctly Catholic attribute (50).[27] Moreover, the promulgation of such a doctrine indicates almost Jesuitical motives, which the reviewer implicitly contrasts with motives of the Established clergy: "It is but justice to them [the Tractarians] to say, that their views are less worldly, and the objects they aim at of a nobler character: the worldly power and splendour of the establishment are less attractive to their ambition than the more real, and . . . more precious power of ruling the minds and consciences of men" (45).

Williams does not respond to this already extant hostility toward reserve with conciliation; rather, he promotes his doctrinal secrecy as a source of spiritual authority, thereby shifting the debate to an extra-political register in which reserve could be made attractive to his spiritually radical but politically conservative readers. Williams seems especially desirous of provoking an extreme reaction to his doctrinal radicalism in *Tract 80,* which appeared on the heels of Froude's *Remains.* In the following passage on the need for reserve in a post-lapsarian world, for example, Williams not only invokes sacramentalism but also appears to say that Protestants are as much in error as Roman Catholics on the subject:

> when religion has been decaying in the minds of men, GOD has either allowed His Divine presence to be hid from them, by the errors of the Roman Catholics on the one side, which would have the effect of a veil, like a type and figure, in concealing His presence under a low and carnal notion; or has left men to deny that presence altogether, (as Protestants are inclined to do,) so that a Sacrament would be to them no Sacrament, as far as the Divine power is displayed in it—but merely like a picture, or representation of our SAVIOUR'S sufferings—no more. Nor in this view are we at all considering it, as if GOD was the author of evil, but rather seeing His hand controlling the errors of men, and judicially present, as so often represented, even in their wickedness. (*Tracts,* IV: 80.33)[28]

In fact, the Evangelical Protestant approach to communion is characterized as "evil" and an example of "wickedness." Even in the less sensational *Tract 87,* Williams proposes doctrine and bases for doctrine that would have been very difficult for many Protestants to accept. For example, in the following genealogy of reserve, Williams explicitly refers to Newman's description of a *disciplina arcani* in the *History of the Arians:*

> [T]here were two customs which embody and strongly put forth the principle [of reserve]. The first an external system of discipline, designated by the Latins the Discipline of the Secret [*Disciplina Arcani*], according to which they kept back in reserve the higher doctrines of our Faith, until persons were rendered fit to receive them by a long previous preparation. The other an universal rule in the explanations of GOD'S Word, which is founded on the supposition that it contains mystical meanings disclosed only unto the faithful (*Tracts,* V: 87.6).

What would have made this reference so troubling for many Protestants was not only its doctrine—though that was already cause for suspicion, as the earlier review of Newman's *History of the Arians* plainly showed—but the way in which this doctrine was justified. Contrary to Establishment teaching and Evangelical practice, Williams proposes that sources for doctrine can be found outside of the Bible, in both early Christian practices and later scriptural exegesis. Such a proposal would have looked suspiciously Popish since it implies that "ordinary" readers of the bible need guidance and instruction from those better versed in Church history and scriptural commentary, from what anti-Catholic rhetoric would call a "priesthood."

This implicit division between ordinary Christians and those fully initiated into the secrets of Christianity appears more explicitly when Williams cites the Platonist divine, Origen (c.185–c. 254), as an authority on reserve: "Thus every soul which is given up to GOD, and hath entered into His truth, beyond what is known to the many, and hath partaken of His Divinity, surpasses comprehension of the multitude, so that it assumes a veil in order to direct inferiors, by discoursing on matters level to their comprehensions" (*Tracts,* V: 87.21). Not only does Origen appear to confirm Williams's yearning for a "priesthood," but such an appeal to an extra-biblical, and, even for the early Church, a theologically questionable source, reinforces the *Tract*'s earlier assertion that bases for doctrine can and should be sought for outside of Scripture. According to Williams, the reason that such extra-biblical sources can provide authoritative doctrinal proscriptions is that all human experience, not just Scripture, can be read typologically:

> But the principle upon which ancient writers explain Scripture they do not apply to that alone, but to all the ways of GOD, and frequently connect this also with our

> LORD'S conduct. It is not Holy Writ only with them, but the visible creation also, and natural providence, and sacramental mysteries, which are the veils of Divinity, through which and by which the ALMIGHTY speaks darkly to His creatures, concealing or disclosing Himself as they are found worthy" (*Tracts,* V: 87.27).

For many, Williams's proposal for a divinely-sanctioned hierarchy of worthiness meant, in the words of W. R. Church, "that the real spirit of the party was disclosed; its love of secret and crooked methods, its indifference to knowledge, its disingenuous professions, its deliberate concealments, its holding doctrines and its pursuit of aims which it dared not avow, its disciplina arcani, its conspiracies, its Jesuistical spirit" (264–65).

However, there remains another side to Tractarian reserve, and Williams employs a number of rhetorical strategies to emphasize the attractiveness of his secretive doctrine. His most visible device is to repeatedly attack Evangelical Protestantism, a move we have already seen in his remarks on the sacrament of communion. As Adams explains, one goal of these attacks was to strengthen the bond among Tractarians by making them the target of reactionary counterattacks: "reserve . . . might be deployed in part to solicit the hostility of the world at large, and thereby to underscore the corporate integrity of the Oxford Movement as a male order akin to a secret society" (88). This strategy had a class dimension as well; as the religious movement most closely associated with what Bagehot would label the masses, Evangelical Protestantism serves as an emblem of middle-class standards of value which Williams views as symptoms of fallenness. He argues that broadly middle-class attempts to cast aside reserve and to "speak the truth plainly" reveals a paucity of natural feeling, an absence of the very truth its speakers seek to express:

> When that reserve is cast aside, there is a want of true and deep feeling; and this may be seen in the rejection of strong typical and figurative, and, therefore, half-secret expressions with which deep feeling is apt to clothe itself. Thus, in early periods of a nation, when their sense of the great and marvelous is strongest, they make use of those terms or modes of speech, which partake more of the infinite and divine; and their language, as they become more civilized, will partake more of the character of what is earthly and human. They adopt what they think to be more full expressions of their meaning; but the fact is, that they are general expressions, and therefore more limited and finite, and as such indicate rather a straining after such strong feeling, which they have not, than an expression of it. (*Tracts,* IV: 80.54)

In post-lapsarian England, then, the only way to express the truth is to ignore the ceaseless yammering of middle-class preachers and pundits and to remain, like Carlyle's Teufeldröckh, eloquently silent.

Williams justifies this rejection of middle-class openness by appealing to what his readers were likely to view as the ultimate extra-political source of spiritual authority, the Bible. Specifically, he grounds the doctrine of reserve in Matthew 7.6, from the Sermon on the Mount, in which Jesus advises the people against "giving that which is holy to the dogs," and "casting pearls before swine." Speaking on parables, Williams declares, "Might it not be that the most spiritual and heavenly precepts were thus left to the rude and rough world, so that the veil of the figure might still be over them, through disclosing its import to any attentive and thoughtful person; performing thus by themselves through the wonderful wisdom of GOD, that which He has commanded us to observe, in not 'giving that which is holy to the dogs,' and not 'casting pearls before swine'" (*Tracts,* IV: 80.10). Generalizing from this he later explains, "That, as our LORD wrapt up the most sacred and divine truths in parables and mysterious sayings, so we find, that in good men there is a natural reserve of expression, which is apt to veil from the world holy sentiments; in both cases the end is observed, of keeping 'that which is holy from dogs'" (*Tracts,* IV: 80.58–59). He also reinforces this apparent biblical injunction with the spiritual authority of St. Athanasius. According to Williams, reserve is "a moral duty incumbent on teachers of the truth. We have, again, the very high authority of St. Athanasius for knowing, that the disciples themselves did observe precisely a similar caution from the beginning to that which our LORD had observed towards them, and this testimony connects this reserve of the Ancient Church by an unbroken chain with our LORD Himself" (*Tracts,* V: 87.13). Williams thus offers reserve as an even more spiritually-resonant version of Arnold's yearning, two years earlier, for privileged access to "life in its true reality."

This assiduous promotion of the biblically-authorized spiritual side to reserve makes politically-resonant attacks on Tractarian secrecy as Jesuitical ring hollow. The engineered irrelevance of the figure of Jesuitism is especially noticeable in an August, 1838 article in *Fraser's Magazine,* entitled "Treason Within the Church."[29] This article describes as its chief object an exposure of the fact that the Tractarians were attempting "to lower the Reformation; to restore Popery to high estimation among us, and thus to prepare the way for a reunion with Rome, and an abandonment of Protestantism" (192). For the writer, such an attempt could mean only one thing: "Remembering the well-authenticated facts which are now upon record, as to the disguises assumed by Jesuit priests in the days of Elizabeth and her successors, we cannot dismiss from our minds the apprehension, that, among the leading spirits of this sect, there must exist some one or more who are diligently, though covertly, doing the work of the apostolic church and of her most subtle missionaries, the followers of Ignatius Loyola" (187). Unfortunately for its author, such general appeals to Elizabethan precedent carry little weight when compared with Williams's specific citations of much older spiritual authorities. In fact, printed under the same title in the December issue of *Fraser's,* a response

called the above article "a piece of Protestant jesuitism, quite worthy of Loyola" (751). Not only does this response echo the charges of a counter-conspiracy that surfaced in the periodical debate over the Hampden controversy, it also reveals just how vulnerable spurious political invocations of the figure of Jesuitism could be to competing claims of spiritual authority made by Anglo-Catholics.

III. Papal Aggression

This potential for instability in the political stance of anti-Catholicism surfaces again in mid-century debates over the restoration of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Britain, or "papal aggression" as it was popularly known. The years between Williams's two *Tracts* on reserve and the papal brief that elevated Vicars Apostolic to Bishops and Archbishops were trying ones for the Establishment. Irish immigration in the "hungry forties" both increased the number of Roman Catholics in England dramatically and pushed Roman Catholic political opinion in the direction of working-class Radicalism by sheer dint of numbers. In addition, the Irish brought with them a penchant for membership in various Irish nationalist secret societies (i.e., the United Irishmen and the Ribboners) that often blurred the distinction between religion and politics. The public uproar over government funding of Maynooth College and the conversion of prominent public figures like Newman added to Protestant anxiety. The proverbial last straw, however, was the highly publicized Gorham decision, in which the courts upheld Parliament's right to intervene in the affairs of the Established Church. Calls for disestablishment soon followed. "Papal aggression" provided a convenient target for cathartic attacks by English Protestants, many of whom revived the accusations of conspiracy and Jesuitism already employed earlier in the century in order to foster, even if only briefly, a common spirit of nationalism.[30] The fact that the papal brief immediately followed the Pope's restoration to the Vatican by Republican France encouraged such a nationalistic response,[31] as did the supremely self-confident language of the brief itself.[32] This nationalistic reaction to the so-called "papal aggression" reached the highest levels of British society, with Lord John Russell feeling moved to write his infamous "Durham Letter," the national publication of which appeared to add ministerial authority to the anti-papal position.[33] Even at its most vehement, however, criticism of "papal aggression" was always careful to claim the majority of English Catholics as loyal citizens, including them within the fold of those under attack. This strategy of using the figure of Jesuitism to attack a largely foreign threat represents a shift in England's rhetoric of conspiracy, and provides an early indication of the ways in which that rhetoric would be internationalized in the following decades.

Ironically, public reaction might never have reached quite the peak that it did had not the announcement of the restoration been accompanied by the newly-promoted Cardinal Wiseman's pastoral, *Out of the Flaminian Gate.* Sent to the Roman Catholic clergy in England on 7 October and publicly read and reprinted in most of the nation's newspapers on 17 October 1850, Wiseman's pastoral seemed to confirm that the papal brief constituted a direct challenge to England's national sovereignty.[34] Exuberant declarations that Catholic England had been "restored to its orbit in the ecclesiastical firmament" around the papal "centre of unity, the source of jurisdiction, of light and vigour," appeared to claim an almost territorial right to England (*The Annual Register, 1850,* 413). At the same time, references to the "Saints of our country" and "those blessed martyrs of these latter ages," both said by the pastoral to be rejoicing over "this new evidence of the faith and Church which led them to glory," were simply insulting to many Protestants, who were implicitly branded as persecutors responsible for the long "departure of England's religious glory" (*The Annual Register, 1850,* 413). However, Englishmen objected most strongly to Wiseman's assertion that "we govern and shall continue to govern the counties of Middlesex, Herrford, and Essex . . . and those of Surrey, Sussex, Kent, Berkshire, and Hampshire, with the islands annexed" (*The Annual Register, 1850,* 412). The fact that Wiseman meant "govern" in a purely ecclesiastical sense and only in regard to English Catholics was largely lost in the ensuing public reaction.

This reaction to the Papal brief had actually begun three days earlier in *The Times,* with a somewhat naïve editorial dismissing Wiseman's appointment as Archbishop of Westminster as a ridiculous Papal delusion.[35] Once the paper had determined that Wiseman's title signaled a full-scale restoration, and once it had been sufficiently aroused by Wiseman's unfortunate choice of words in *Out of the Flaminian Gate,* its reaction became much more vehement. In quick succession, editorials from 19, 22 and 24 October denounced the restoration as "an audacious and conspicuous display of pretensions to resume the absolute spiritual dominion of this island which Rome has never abandoned" and "a direct usurpation of a supreme spiritual power by a foreign priest over the length and breadth of this land."[36] As the paper explained, "these seditious synods, these fictional dioceses, and these indefinite episcopal powers, are avowedly intended to carry on a more active warfare against the liberties and the faith of the people of England."[37] Certainly the most threatening of the new Roman Catholic dioceses was that of Westminster, over which Wiseman himself would preside. This apparently direct challenge to the existing Anglican diocese of Westminster and the eminent Protestants buried therein prompted *The Times* to declare,

> Is it then here, in Westminster, among ourselves and by the English Throne, that an Italian priest is to parcel out the spiritual dominion of this country—to employ

> renegades of our national Church to restore a foreign usurpation over the consciences of men, and to sow division in our political society by an undisguised and systematic hostility to the institutions most nearly identified with our national freedom and our national faith? Such an intention must either be ludicrous or intolerable—either a delusion of some fanatical brain or treason to the Constitution.[38]

After these three editorials, Prussian military exploits in Europe largely supplanted the restoration of the Catholic hierarchy as the leading story in *The Times,* although the paper continued to keep a close anti-Catholic eye on the progress of "papal aggression." For example, two articles printed on 6 and 7 November as part of the national commemoration of Guy Fawkes day and headed "The Gunpowder Plot" both suggested that the specter of Jesuitism might be especially relevant for contemporary readers.[39] However, three more moderate pieces between 8 and 16 November show that the early furor over the restoration was giving way to less exclusively inflammatory language. A letter to the editor from 8 November entitled "Papal Aggression" even minimized the danger posed by Rome in language that echoes chapter 37 of *Barnaby Rudge:* "Whatever be the destiny of Smithfield as a market, I do not look forward to its reappropriation as a place of execution for heresy."

By mid-November Roman Catholic leaders, too, had begun to respond to the explosion of anti-Catholicism prompted by the restoration of the hierarchy, with Wiseman's *An Appeal to the Reason and Good Feeling of the English People* serving as the most complete statement of their position. Begun on 11 November and completed in less than a week, Wiseman's *Appeal* appeared on 20 November and sold an incredible 30,000 copies in three days (Norman, *Anti-Catholicism,* 62–63). Employing a calm rationality much removed from the rhetoric of *Out of the Flaminian Gate,* this pamphlet responds to all of the major objections to the Roman Catholic restoration. It begins by providing readers with background on the prior administration of the English Catholics through the Vicars Apostolic and the desire for a better regulated internal structure for English Catholicism (1–6). This desire, and not "thoughts of aggression" or "stupid ideas of rivalry with the Established Church" (4), led to a deputation to Rome in 1847 and subsequent approval from the Pope to reestablish the hierarchy. Once this background is out of the way, Wiseman cleverly appeals to the same middle-class definition of Englishness repudiated by Williams in order to palliate suspect readers, calling upon "the manly sense and honest heart of a generous people; that love of honourable dealing and fair play, which, in joke or in earnest, is equally the instinct of an Englishman; that hatred of all mean advantage taken, of all base tricks and paltry clap-traps and party cries employed to hunt down a rival or a foe" (9).

He then goes on to provide a point-by-point rebuttal of every objection raised in the papers. He distinguishes between the Crown's temporal and spiritual supremacy, declaring that, like Dissenters, Catholics fully admit the first but not the second, which is reserved for members of the Church of England alone (10–13). Using the Catholic Emancipation Act, Wiseman also asserts the legality of having local bishops (13–16). In addition, he explains that the Pope was involved not as a foreign political power, but as the only legitimate spiritual authority for Roman Catholics. As Wiseman explains it, this involvement of the Pope does not infringe upon the Crown's prerogative because England does not even formally recognize the authority of the Vatican and hence cannot lose its prerogative to a non-existent power. Finally, Wiseman demonstrates the fundamental inconsistency of objecting to a Catholic hierarchy in Britain when such a hierarchy had already been sanctioned in many of Britain's colonies.

In many ways, the *Appeal* was a success, largely silencing *The Times* and reaching a wide audience of metropolitan readers; however, as the *Westminster Review* remarked two months later, "An uneasy suspicion remains that a step made good by the papal hierarchy, introduces an unsound element into English life; that the case of the Roman Catholics, is not parallel with that of the modern Nonconformists; and that, however we may ignore the red hat and the archepiscopal title, Dr. Wiseman continues after all something more to the state than a 'Dissenting minister'" ("The Battle of the Churches," 446).[40] Other periodicals, noticeably *Blackwood's,* demonstrated just how strong this "uneasy suspicion" remained, and how much of it was based on fears of Catholic conspiracies. For example, one reviewer used the apparently imperial sentiments expressed in Wiseman's pastoral as evidence that some Catholics were treasonably breaking the oath of allegiance provided in the Catholic Relief Act and therefore did not deserve the full rights of citizenship:

> The sacredness of oaths is essential to the *existence* of society: the man who is not to be believed on his oath is self-banished, self-disenfranchised, self-excluded from all the rights of society; for the obvious reason, that, if all men were equally false, society *must* dissolve. Such a man is no longer entitled to the protection of the law. And the same rule is inevitably applicable to any institution which thus sets itself at war with society. Popery is *anti-social*. ("Popery in the Nineteenth Century," 252–53)

This same article saw this anti-social side of Roman Catholicism as stemming from the inevitable presence of the Jesuitical spirit: "Rome is all *artifice,* and we may be well assured that, whether under the name of Oratorians, or Preachers, or Brethren of the Spirit, the craft of Jesuitry will be exercised to make its way into England, and keep its footing here" (255–56). A later article expressed similar sen-

timents, revealing the continued usefulness of accusations of Jesuitism to the anti-Catholic cause:

> a working army they may be called, that, though they seem dispersed and banished, are emissaries everywhere, and rise up in multitudes where it was thought there were none. They are allowed to assume whatever dress they please; for their better disguise, any occupation: they are in the highest and lowest conditions, and have been known to appear as zealous members of conventicles. ("The Papal Aggression Bill," 574)

Such descriptions bordered on paranoia and encouraged the establishment of a state of panoptical surveillance not unlike that described and criticized by Steinmetz in *The Novitiate.* Combined with the earlier distrust of Catholic oaths, these charges of Jesuitism bear a clear resemblance to those of Thuggism brought against the Glasgow spinners. This connection between anti-Catholicism and anti-unionism became overt when the same article argued for limits to religious toleration: "It is possible that there may be religions that, being tolerated, would in practice not only destroy every other, but the very name of liberty. Even Thuggism professes to be a religion, and secret murder its duty. Would it be religious liberty to tolerate the Suttees and Juggernauts of India?" (573). Of course, the article quickly demurred, "We do not mean to make offensive comparisons: we only put the case strongly, to show how obvious it is that toleration must have its limits" (573),[41] but by then the rhetorical connection to "Glasgow Thuggery" was hard to ignore.

These comments in *Blackwood's* represent the extreme end of what was an almost-universal condemnation of "papal aggression"; in fact, aside from Catholic periodicals like the *Dublin Review,* only *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine* dared to challenge the popular outcry.[42] Three articles by J. R. Beard attempted to convince *Tait's* readers that "so far as the nation *has* joined the 'alarm and indignation' cry, there *is* a national mistake—a wide, wild, dangerous mistake" ("What Is It All About?" 43).[43] According to Beard, this mistake occurred because otherwise sincere anti-papists have come "to the question filled with a laudable repugnance to priestly pretensions, [but] have, in their zeal and haste, allowed their feelings to master their judgment, and, among other confoundings of things that differ, have confounded the civil with the spiritual, claims with powers, and names with things" ("What Is It All About?" 45). Their zeal has also led them to ignore the facts and examples of history:

> Whose mind does not, at the first hint of the subject, fly back first, but not only, to the "Popish Plot" of the seventeenth century—that most hideous page of English history? Think for a moment of the idiotic origin, and yet the long continuance and

> ferocious cruelties of *that* alarm. . . . A sensible people for five years struck mad; a courageous people for five years in abject terror; a generous and clement people for five years imbruing their hands in innocent blood. ("What Is It All About?" 43)

If such an extreme reaction was idiotic then, Beard declares it even more idiotic now, since "The change, we say, is one which, besides affecting Roman Catholics only, as rendering them more independent of Rome, does not affect or concern other people at all" ("What Is It All About?" 47).[44] Beard even borrows a page from Wiseman's *Appeal* when he scathingly remarks that "the *spirit* and *language* in which this misdirected and exaggerated agitation has been carried on have been discreditable and injurious to our character as Englishmen, whose motto is fair play, and as Protestants, whose doctrine is toleration" ("What Is It All About?" 51). This final reference to a definition of Englishness fundamentally opposed to the kind of false appeals to past conspiracies and the spirit of Jesuitism that made up the basis of English "No Popery" challenges the anti-Catholic position where it is most vulnerable: its confusion of nationalist ideologies.

This same ideological confusion, especially as it was reflected in the figure of the secret society, would come under even closer scrutiny in John Henry Newman's *Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England*.[45] Written with a penetrating wit, these *Lectures* expose a number of fallacies within the anti-Catholic uproar over the restoration of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Britain.[46] At the root of these fallacies is the tacit force of what Newman broadly refers to as "tradition" in its least edifying sense, what, following Jaroslav Pelikan, we might designate traditionalism, or simply the inertia of prejudice. Since anti-Catholicism for Newman is *the* "Tradition of the Court, and of the Law, and of Society, and of Literature" all working together (73), it remains at once imbedded and unexamined in English culture. This tradition, rather than any recognized standards of truth and falsehood, forms the basis for all English perceptions of Roman Catholicism:

> it is, forsooth, our received policy, as Englishmen, our traditionary view of things, to paint up the Pope and Papists in a certain style. . . . True or false is not the question . . . its costume is fixed, like the wigs of our judges, or the mace of our mayors. Have not freeborn Britons a right to think as they please? We rule Popery to be what we say it is, not by history, but by an Act of Parliament; not by sight or hearing, but by the national will. It is the will of the Legislature, it is the voice of the people, which gives facts their complexion, and logic its course, and ideas their definition." (10–11)

At its extreme, this willfully misinformed Papal costume dresses up the Roman Catholic Church as "a sorceress, intoxicating the nations with a goblet of blood" (14). Even

when not clothed in such fantastical garb, however, "reasons of State political and national, prevent her [the Catholic Church] from being heard in her own defence. She is considered too absurd to be inquired into, and too corrupt to be defended, and too dangerous to be treated with equity and fair dealing" (11–12). As Newman succinctly states, by managing to at once represent Roman Catholicism in whatever way seems convenient and to silence all opposition to this representation, the anti-Catholic tradition in effect creates Popery in its own image, "the victim of a prejudice which perpetuates itself, and gives birth to what it feeds upon" (12).

As long as this self-generating tradition remains tacitly accepted, it allows for all sorts of logical inconsistencies to be practiced by otherwise reasonable English Protestants. On the subject of religious toleration, for example, Englishmen seem to consider it a duty to secure freedom of worship for "Unitarians, Sabellians, Utilitarians, Wesleyans, Calvinists, Swedenborgians, Irvingites, [and] Freethinkers" (75–76), many of whom, Newman notes, believe doctrines much less in agreement with Established teaching than do Roman Catholics. From a legal perspective, the treatment of Roman Catholics is also at variance with the normal English requirement "that an accuser should have something to say for himself, before he can put the accused on his defense": "This righteous rule is simply set aside in the treatment of Catholics and their religion. Instead of the *onus probandi,* as it is called, the burden of proof, lying with the accuser, it is simply thrown upon the accused" (90). Even some of the charges made against Roman Catholicism are shown by Newman to be, at best, hypocritical. For example, it was common practice in nineteenth-century England to charge Catholics with an undue veneration for images; yet, Protestants seem to demonstrate a similar feeling in their delight—especially on Guy Fawkes Day—in burning "Bishops, or Cardinals, or Popes in *effigy*" (180). Even Protestants' perception of history is skewed by their resolute adherence to tradition:

> It is familiar to an Englishman to wonder at and to pity the recluse and the devotee who surround themselves with a high enclosure, and shut out what is on the other side of it; but was there ever such an instance of self-sufficient, dense, and ridiculous bigotry, as that which rises up and walls in the minds of our fellow-countrymen from all knowledge of one of the most remarkable phenomena which the history of the world has seen? This broad fact of Catholicism—as real as the continent of America, or the Milky Way—which Englishmen cannot deny, they will not entertain; they shut their eyes, they thrust their heads into the sand, and try to get rid of a great vision, a great reality, under the name of Popery. (43)

Given all of these instances in which English anti-Catholics violate their own principles as a result of their "traditionary view of things," Newman concludes "that the

anti-Catholic Tradition could not be kept alive, would die of exhaustion, without a continual supply of fable" (128), much of it readily available during the debate over the restoration.

The *Lectures* cannily recognize that much of this "fable" sustaining popular anti-Catholic prejudice originates in the ready applicability of the figure of the secret society to Roman Catholicism. Newman refutes this figure in two ways, first by exposing the lack of factual evidence for charges leveled at the Jesuits themselves:

> If there be any set of men in the whole world who are railed against as the pattern of all evil, it is the Jesuit body. It is vain to ask their slanderers what they know of them; did they ever see a Jesuit? can they say whether there are many or few? what do they know of their teaching? "Oh! it is quite *notorious,*" they reply: "you might as well deny the sun in heaven; it is notorious that the Jesuits are a crafty, intriguing, unscrupulous, desperate, murderous, and exceedingly able body of men; a secret society, ever plotting against liberty, and government, and progress, and thought, and the prosperity of England. Nay it is awful; they disguise themselves in a thousand shapes . . . they prowl about with handsome stocks and stylish waistcoats, and gold chains about their persons, or in fustian jackets, as the case may be; and they do not hesitate to shed the blood of any one whatever, prince or peasant, who stands in their way." Who can fathom the inanity of such statements?—which are made and therefore, I suppose, believed, not merely by the ignorant, but by educated men, who ought to know better. (17)

Newman then expands his farcical argument to national proportions when he sets out to "try whether something of a monster indictment, similarly frightful and similarly fantastical to that which is got up against Catholicism, might not be framed against some other institution or power, or parallel greatness and excellence, in its degree and place, to the communion of Rome" (25), namely to see whether one might deploy accusations of a Jesuitical nature against the British Constitution.[47]

In order to present such a hypothetical scenario and to make it comparable to that of the Roman Catholics in England, Newman transports his readers to a public square in Russia. Here, he supposes a speaker who knows nothing first-hand of England, "but who has dipped into Blackstone and several English writers, and has picked up facts at third or fourth hand, and has got together a crude farrago of ideas, words, and instances, a little truth, a deal of falsehood, a deal of misrepresentation, a deal of nonsense, and a deal of invention" (26). This speaker, "a member of a junior branch of the Potemkin family . . . who has acquired the title of Blood-sucker" (27), is set to harangue a sympathetic crowd, got together for just this purpose by Russian leaders, on the dangers of those who support the British Constitution. According

to the fictional speaker, these "Anglo-maniacs, or John-Bullists, as they are properly termed" (26), constitute "a perfidious power . . . which is yearly aggrandizing itself in East, West, and South, which is engaged in one enormous conspiracy against all States, and which was even aiming at modifying the old institutions of the North, and at dressing up the army, navy, legislature, and executive of his own country in the livery of Queen Victoria" (27). They support something called the British Constitution, a "crazy, old-fashioned piece of furniture, and an eyesore in the nineteenth century, and would not last a dozen years" without their conspiratorial plotting (28).

Once Newman begins to put the more extreme language of the anti-Catholic position into the mouth of his speaker, his farce grows even more critical of "No Popery." Using uncontextualized excerpts from *Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England,* the fictional speaker constructs a case for John-Bullists being agents of the Antichrist, who turns out to be none other than Queen Victoria: "Queen Victoria is distinctly pointed out in the Book of Revelation as having the number of the beast! You may recollect that number of 666; now, she came to the throne in the year thirty-seven, at which date she was eighteen years old. Multiply then 37 by 18, and you have the very number 666, which is the mystical emblem of the lawless King!!!" (35). Mirroring of the way in which the exponents of "No Popery!" justified their collapse of past and present evidence, the speaker then uses various historical examples of English executions, wars, etc., to prove that "John-Bullism, through a space of 800 years, is *semper idem,* unchangeable in evil" (37). The meeting ends with a public riot in which "all poured out into the square, and proceeded to break the windows of all the British residents. They then formed into procession, and directing their course to the great square before the Kremlin, they dragged through the mud, and then solemnly burnt, an effigy of John Bull which had been provided before hand by the managing committee, a lion and unicorn, and a Queen Victoria" (41).

Such actions so closely emulate those of actual English anti-Catholics that it is almost unnecessary for Newman to "deliberately assert that no absurdities contained in the above sketch can equal—nay, that no conceivable absurdities can surpass—the absurdities which are firmly believed of Catholics by sensible, kind-hearted, well-intentioned Protestants" (41). In order to convert these misinformed but ultimately fair-minded critics to a more tolerant position, English Roman Catholics need to wage a war of accurate information. As Newman explains, modern religious debate is different "from the case of actual warfare, in which ignorance is weakness, here ignorance is power" (365). Hence, Catholics need to replace the popular anti-Catholic tradition with a truer picture of their actual beliefs and practices if they hope to gain public acceptance.

IV. Conclusions

By ultimately advocating publicity in the *Lectures,* Newman acknowledges and draws upon the authority publicly accrued in middle-class Victorian England through transparent, open behavior. His strategic deployment of a vision of the English as willing to reform their anti-Catholic prejudices in light of evidence that is fairly and unreservedly presented echoes the conciliatory tone adopted by earlier apologies for Roman Catholicism, including the two articles on Catholic emancipation, "Catholic Question" and "The Last of the Catholic Question," Wiseman's *Appeal* and J. R. Beard's concluding remarks in "What Is It All About?" At the same time, it is important to recognize that Newman's advice to his readers, that they should better educate their neighbors about Catholic doctrine, does not open up formerly secretive behavior to public view; in other words, Newman is not inviting Protestants into the confessional, he is merely explaining the doctrinal value of auricular confession. In this way he reemphasizes the prior arguments of those like Wiseman and J. R. Beard that the temporal and spiritual aspects of Roman Catholicism need to remain distinct. In partitioning off doctrine from practice, Newman also allows for the continued aesthetic and spiritual attractiveness of divinely-sanctioned Roman Catholic reserve by cannily tacking between both sides of Victorian England's dialectic rhetoric of secrecy.[48]

Newman's *Lectures,* together with other material from the period surrounding the restoration of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Britain also demonstrate a gradual turning outward effected by the twenty-year discussion of Catholicism in England. During the public debate over the Catholic Emancipation Act, critics were primarily concerned with repressing what *Blackwood's* referred to as the "contemptible domestic enemy." This strategy of branding Catholic and Catholic-like groups as an internal threat to English sovereignty continued through the reaction to Tractarianism, as *Fraser's Magazine's* provocatively titled article, "Treason in the Church," makes clear. However, by 1850 anti-Catholic rhetoric began to change. Domestic Catholics were carefully included among those threatened by the "papal aggression," which was painstakingly constructed as a foreign threat.[49] In thus internationalizing the Catholic threat, English Protestants suggest how anti-Catholicism can be deployed in order to further the construction of a national ideology of Englishness as open and rational. However, because this ideology is based, at least in part, on a continued denunciation of secretive practices, and hence a grounding of meaning in the absence of secrecy, it remains open to the results of its own rhetoric. Not only might secrecy be represented as central to the open rationality of England through the kind of farcical portraiture offered by Newman, but a similar alliance of secretive practices and "respectable" English society would emerge out of later reactions to the Indian Mutiny.

4

"Some Deep, Designing Men": The Making of the Indian Mutiny

As we have already seen, in 1839 in *Chartism* Carlyle makes opportunistic use of an Indian secret society, the Thugs, to characterize the Glasgow spinners union as a dangerous conspiracy. That same year, Philip Meadows Taylor drew on his experience as Assistant Superintendent of Police in west-central India to produce *Confessions of a Thug,* an extraordinary account of ritual highway robbery and murder told first-hand by Ameer Ali, a former Thug turned government informer. The confessed murderer of seven hundred and nineteen persons, Ali remains a curiously ambiguous figure for Meadows Taylor's narrator, who condemns his profession as "horrible" even as he admits to a "fearful interest" in this otherwise highly articulate and intelligent man (5).[1] English readers were similarly fascinated by *Confessions,* which established Meadows Taylor's reputation as a popular novelist, even as, according to the novel's modern editor, Taylor's text largely "helped to confirm the stereotype of India . . . as a retrograde, anarchic society that could hardly be called a civilization" (viii).[2] The novel's central figure of Thuggee, and the kind of virulent religious bigotry exhibited during the debate of the Catholic Question, combined in the late 1850s, when England's complacent ignorance regarding its Indian possessions was replaced by a national sense of horror and fascination.

The reason for this increase in public awareness was nothing less than the rebellion of much of northern British India. The rebellion quickly became the single most-talked-about topic in England, motivating even those who ordinarily took little notice of colonial affairs to form an opinion of what came to be known as the Indian Mutiny. This escalation of interest is well-documented by an otherwise picturesque travelogue in *Bentley's Miscellany:*

> At the present moment the city of Delhi has a most painful interest attached to it, having become the centre of a mighty conspiracy for the overthrow of our Eastern Empire, and apparently for the extermination of our countrymen in India. As we know too well, this has been in part accomplished, and vigorous attempt is being made for its completion. A short sketch of the place, therefore, will not be unacceptable to the public, even those who at other times take no interest in the East. ("The Grand Mosque and Imperial Palace of Delhi," 546)

The terms employed by this travel writer to justify his architectural tour of Delhi help to illuminate the reasons behind calling the uprisings in Oude and other provinces the "Indian Mutiny." Surprised by widespread disaffection in its most prosperous colony, authorities in England struggled to understand and contain what was increasingly seen as "a mighty conspiracy for the overthrow of our Eastern Empire." As at the trial of the Glasgow Spinners, the problem was to acknowledge the presence of rebellious sentiment without allowing that sentiment to become outright rebellion; in other words, to excite public condemnation without simultaneously igniting public fear. The label "Indian Mutiny" performs this dual task admirably by casting the rebellion in a specifically colonial frame of reference primed to interpret any resistance to British rule as a mutinous conspiracy. It thereby distances the rebellion to the colonies and implies that those rebelling are doing so in secret and despite their obligations to England.

British MPs and periodical writers thus began to apply the familiar rhetoric of conspiracy and the figure of the secret society to represent Indian resistance to British colonial rule. As in the response to "Papal aggression," this strategy was overtly nationalistic, pitting faithful British Christians against conspiring foreign heathens in a contest of national pride. To these nationalistic constructions the rhetoric surrounding the Indian Mutiny also added the dimension of race, further sundering English and Indian from one another.

The first section of this chapter examines this rhetoric of conspiracy more closely in order to demonstrate how the figure of the secret society was brought to bear during Britain's Indian crisis to foster British nationalism and to repress liberal democratic reform in British India. This mixture of empire and political representation continues the internationalization of England's rhetoric of conspiracy that we have already seen during "Papal aggression." Such a major shift in emphasis away from domestic politics went unquestioned during the Mutiny, however, largely because India remained far more immanent than its geography would imply by virtue of the many Anglo-Indians who had returned to England from colonial service and the many placed in harm's way by the outbreak of rebellion.

The second section of the chapter traces resistance to this strategy in Wilkie Collins's *The Moonstone* (1868), a novel that simultaneously appropriates the rhetoric of con-

spiracy surrounding the Mutiny and reverses its imperialistic implications. Offering readers a fictional "Hindoo conspiracy," Collins uses a range of techniques, including temporal and spatial doubling, that forces readers to reexamine Britain's role in the Mutiny. Read in opposition to earlier representations of the rebellion, the novel can be seen to deploy the figure of the secret society to bring together the very groups that its invocation during the Indian Mutiny was meant to distance from one another.

I. The Indian Mutiny

On 10 May 1857, the 11th and 20th Native Infantry and the 3rd Light Cavalry regiments of the Bengal Army at Meerut began what would come to be known in England as the Indian Mutiny by shooting their British officers, breaking open the gaol, setting fire to several buildings, and marching off towards Delhi, thirty-eight miles to the southeast. Upon arriving there the next day, they proclaimed the aging King of Delhi their leader, killed every European they could find and declared that they were reestablishing the Mogul Empire in India.[3] The Mutiny spread quickly through the rest of the Bengal Army until, by the end of June, much of northern India centered on the Province of Oude was no longer under British control.[4] Strategically, the three most significant gains for the rebels were Delhi, where anti-British if not nascent nationalist sentiments combined with one of the largest ammunition depots in India; Lucknow, where a small number of British soldiers and civilians were surrounded by what would eventually grow to 50,000 or more rebel troops and irregulars; and Cawnpore, where the Nana Sahib's massacre of British women and children—the infamous Well of Cawnpore incident—would provide an emotional rallying point for British forces throughout India.[5] The British counter-offensive concentrated on these and other captured cities and forts and by the end of August had succeeded in reconquering a significant portion of northern India.[6] Delhi was retaken for good on 20 September and the siege at Lucknow broken only five days later. It would take the rest of the year to drive the remaining rebels from northern India, with the deciding pitched battles occurring at Lucknow (16 November) and Cawnpore (5 December). Guerrilla warfare in central India continued for much of 1858, but none of it posed a dramatic threat to British sovereignty or British civilian lives.

The most immediate cause for this two-year conflict was the introduction of the new Enfield rifle, which required greased cartridges to fire properly. Unfortunately, the lubricant originally applied was a mixture of cow fat, ritually unacceptable to the Hindu majority of the Indian Army, and pig fat, proscribed as unclean for the sizable Muslim minority. This thoughtless choice of lubrication led to fears of a British assault on the two principal religions of the Indian troops and

of a surreptitious attempt to forcibly convert everyone to Christianity. That these fears could lead to armed insurrection and the murder of women and children was interpreted by many in England as a sign of "Asiatic" irrationality and inherent brutality.[7] As the Mutiny progressed, and especially once the Well of Cawnpore incident became well known, this opinion of Asiatic inferiority gained widespread support among rational Englishmen, many of whom recalled "the affair of the greased cartridges" as the first point of evidence against "Asiatics" in general.

However, as Benjamin Disraeli famously stated before the House of Commons on 27 July 1857, "The decline and fall of empires are not affairs of greased cartridges. Such results are occasioned by adequate causes, and by an accumulation of adequate causes" (*Hansard,* 147: 475).[8] In fact, there were numerous "adequate causes" already extant before the Enfield rifle ever arrived on the scene. The Bengal Army was overwhelmingly composed of high-caste Brahmins, many of whom felt contempt not just for the Sikhs and other Muslims enlisted with them, but also for their British officers. Both groups were viewed as inferior according to India's complex caste system, and the British officers had the added disadvantages of haughty aloofness from their men and relative ignorance of the native languages. In addition, British territorial and cultural acquisition of India was proceeding at a rapid pace, thanks in large part to Lord Dalhousie's assertion of the Right of Lapse, which refused to recognize the Indian practice of adoption by declaring the British East India Company sole heir to all native princes without a blooded descendant. The East India Company had also recently annexed the province of Oude, the principle homeland for the Sepoy troops,[9] while British laws had voided the traditional practice of *sati* (1829) and made it possible to convert from Hinduism to Christianity without losing inheritance rights to ancestral property (1850). Missionary activity was also spreading throughout British India, much of it apparently receiving official support from proselytizing army officers and the connections of Lord Canning, the new Governor General, with conversion societies. Finally, the rapid spread of English education, railroads and telegraphs threatened to enforce cultural homogenization, as did the fact that all legal proceedings were conducted in English.

For many in England, though, these were not "adequate causes" for revolt, but rather signs of Britain's imperial benevolence. This benevolence was reflected in what many liberal thinkers considered to be the duty of England towards India: "to carry European civilization into India—to communicate the intelligence of the West—to spread knowledge, and art, and science" ("The English in India," 205). As the same reviewer saw it, the conscientiousness with which this duty had been carried out made it incumbent upon England to continue to govern British India, if for no other reason than to protect its inhabitants from themselves: "On moral grounds, the retention of India is to be justified by every consideration of duty towards its subject races.

We have conquered them, and the only reparation we can make is to rule them. To give them back to their princes, even were it practicable, would be neither right in morals nor in policy. It would be to give them back to anarchy and misrule" ("The English in India," 203). Others concurred, citing past instances of authorized murder that British rule had brought to an end,[10] as well as the democratic elevation of India's 20 million out-castes to the status of men, or at least of domestic servants.[11] *Fraser's Magazine* even summed up the traditions of British India as "perfect religious toleration, and an unceasing, pertinacious effort quietly and gradually to raise the native to the European level in the eye of the law" ("An Anglo-Indian Lament for John Company," 637). In other words, India had heretofore been governed according to the liberal principles of guardianship democracy, and Britain's imperial benevolence lay precisely in the belief that one day Indians might be made British enough to rank as equals with their current guardians.[12]

The ideological payoff for such a belief in the benevolence of British rule was that the Mutiny could be either bracketed off as merely a problem within the army or, even if more widespread, as an undeserved rebellion against just British policies.[13] This was precisely the strategy of one *Bentley's* author, who exonerated British rule in India in the following terms: "The policy which has guided the rulers of India has been essentially that of conciliation, and hence the fearful blow upon us was unmerited. . . . there is some slight consolation in the thought that, if we have hitherto erred in our treatment of the mixed peoples of India, the error has been one of judgment, and the cause of the outbreak cannot be sought in our tyranny" ("Our Indian Empire," *Bentley's Miscellany,* 258). Unfortunately for its author, such a response still begged the question of why, if British rule was so solicitous of native well-being, would Indian confidence in British rule and British intentions be so low that the mistake of the greased cartridges could cause widespread rebellion.[14]

For those determined to believe in Asiatic backwardness and the benevolence of British rule in India there remained another possibility that promised to explain how greased cartridges could lead to rebellion. As Alexander Duff, prominent Protestant missionary and author of *The Indian Rebellion; Its Causes and Results. In a Series of Letters,* wrote in a letter dated 3 June 1857, "the belief is, that some deep, designing men, taking advantage of the superstition of the sepoys, invented these falsehoods [about the intent behind the greased cartridges] to lead them to rise and overthrow the Government" (18). A conspiracy of only a few "deep, designing men" effectively preserves Asiatic inferiority for the majority of the rebels by eliminating their potential for agency even as it casts the few in charge as morally inferior to the British because of their propensity for violent secrecy.

The fact that there were several secret societies known to exist in India at the time added to the force of this line of argument, with each society playing a different role

in the burgeoning rhetoric of conspiracy. Freemasonry had been officially established in Bengal since 1813, and English Masons demonstrated their continued loyalty to the British Government during the Mutiny by volunteering, along with other European civilians, to serve in the Calcutta militia as a deterrent to rebel activity in Britain's Indian capital. Their offer was ultimately accepted by Lord Canning, thereby tacitly continuing Freemasonry's exceptional status as the only governmentally sanctioned secret society in India and showing once again that secrecy itself remained acceptable, even attractive, so long as it was practiced by the right people. The Jesuits played a more ambiguous role, receiving both praise and criticism from English periodical writers during the Mutiny. On the one hand, their past practice of attempting to win converts among high-caste Indians met with approval from some quarters:

> It would be well for the future if our missionaries would take one leaf out of the book of the Jesuit, Francis Xavier. That remarkable man did not fail to address himself to the higher classes in the East, and among these he found many converts. Without neglecting the humble, it would certainly be advisable for British missionaries to address themselves to men in high position, whose example would have weight and influence with retainers and followers. ("India as it is—India as it may be," 226)

On the other hand, they still retained the stigma generated by England's historical anti-Catholicism, as in the following passage, where a general criticism of overzealous missionary activity becomes a more specific indictment of the figure of Jesuitism:

> There can be no doubt that a vague fear of the gradual extinction of Hindooism has been for some years instilling itself into the minds of Hindoos. They see the country covered with missionaries—Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jesuitical—they see bodies of Jesuits located in the towns—a nunnery established at Sirdhanna—simultaneously with the violation of some of the most positive institutions of their religion, such as the abolition of Suttee, &c. They see the English colleges arising for the instruction of Hindoo women, and the English language replacing their own. Their Brahmins perceive an order of christianized Brahmins, Jesuits favoured by the Government, whose principles and practices are not widely different from their own, and it is not surprising that they have viewed these events with suspicion and distrust. ("The Government of India and the Mutinies," 494–95)[15]

The ambiguity accorded to Jesuitism did not extend to India's only well-publicized indigenous secret society, the Thugs, who continued to generate disapprobation in

England. In addition to the pejorative fascination that had been generated by *Confessions of a Thug,* the figurative presence of Thuggery had been further secured by its actual repression in the 1830s and 1840s, making one reviewer's advocacy of the "anti-Thuggee principle" easily recognizable to English readers: "Mercy quite as much as justice demands that, 'on the anti-Thuggee principle,' every village, every haunt should be scoured, and not a man who fought against 'his salt' be left to propagate the idea of future crime" ("Crisis of the Sepoy Rebellion," 566). The Thugs thus provided a historical precedent for how to deal with unacceptable Indian behavior: mercy-by-extermination.

These three actual secret societies added sinister depths to Duff's "deep, designing men," and helped many to believe that the best way to understand the Indian Mutiny was through the familiar figure of the secret society. As during the reaction to the Glasgow Spinners' Trial and Catholic Emancipation, public opinion during the Indian Mutiny partly accepted the conspiracy explanation due to evidence of prior Indian conspiracies. Numerous writers claimed special knowledge of these previous attempts to expel the British in India, and the number of conspiracies continued to grow as the Mutiny progressed. At first, English writers contented themselves with exposing to public view a single plot, centered on Calcutta. Essayists for both *Bentley's Miscellany* and *Blackwood's* told their readers of this "extensive conspiracy among the natives to overthrow the British dominion" as early as September 1857.[16] By November, *Bentley's,* at least, claimed to have discovered a far larger plot, of which the original Calcutta conspiracy was merely an episode: "So far back as the 24th January last, insurrectionary movements had commenced in India; incendiary fires took place, and, before long, Brigadier-General Hearsey became cognizant of an immense conspiracy, which had for its object the destruction of Calcutta and the annihilation of the British" ("The Day of Humiliation," 464). A similar escalation is evident in Duff's *Letters,* which progresses from enumerating the details of the Calcutta plot in a letter dated 16 May to exposing "at least four separate *plots*" in a letter written on 24 June (2, 36). The fact that none of these conspiracies was brought to light until after the Mutiny had already begun suggests that they form part of a containment strategy on the part of English authors.[17] Spatially, the incidents of mutiny and revolt were proliferating at an alarming rate; ideologically, these instances could still be controlled if they were connected. In other words, the "discovery" of prior conspiracies transforms widespread disaffection into conspiratorial plotting, thereby undercutting the revolutionary potential of Indian unrest by attributing it to the machinations of malicious individuals. Moreover, the evidence of prior conspiracies would help to justify almost any level of response on the part of British troops.[18] Finally, by casting the Mutiny as a conspiracy, this British military response could be directed at anyone, since, as *The Annual Register* for 1857

explained, "There can be no doubt that, for some time past, an extensive conspiracy has been forming in the North of India against the continuance of our dominion, but its exact nature and the names of its originators will perhaps never be known" (240). Therefore, the soundest policy would be to treat everyone as a potential conspirator.

In the wake of these revelations of prior conspiracies, the number of English MPs and periodical writers who believed that the Mutiny was the result of a conspiracy grew dramatically. They had already received an impetus in this direction from Disraeli's India speech of 27 July, during which he argued that "the affair of the greased cartridges" was only symptomatic of larger forces at work:

> Is the conduct of the troops the consequence of a sudden impulse, or is it the result of an organized conspiracy? The House must feel that, upon the right appreciation of that issue, the greatest of all questions, namely, the measures which the government ought to adopt, or Parliament ought to sanction, entirely depends. The measures which may be adequate in the case of a military mutiny will not be adequate to cope with a national revolt. The measures which may be perfectly competent to deal with conduct which is only the consequence of sudden impulse will be totally insufficient to deal with conduct which is the consequence of a conspiracy long matured, deeply laid, and extensively ramified. (*Hansard,* 147: 442)[19]

References to an Indian conspiracy were also made by Mr. Whiteside and Lord John Russell before the House of Commons on 11 August 1857 (*Hansard,* 147: 1415–16, 1440).[20] Periodical writers followed Parliament's lead in interpreting the Mutiny as caused by a conspiracy and they began to focus their disapproval on India's Muslim population. In his "few remarks on the recent revolt in our great Indian Empire," one writer felt it safe to refer to "a vast Mahomedan conspiracy long organized, and having for its object the re-establishment of its ancient dominion" as "now accepted as a fact" ("How is India to be Governed?" 122). Others showed similar assurance, with one article in *The London Quarterly Review* feeling it unnecessary even to argue for the existence of a conspiracy, assuming instead that its readers would accept as a foregone conclusion its numerous general references to a conspiracy and unnamed conspirators working behind the scenes to manipulate the Sepoys.[21]

At least some in England were not content with such general references to a conspiracy and sought to make these charges more specific. Among these attempts at greater specificity was a rumor circulated by a number of Indian journals that Russia was somehow behind the Mutiny. This rumor received its most ardent support in England from MP David Urquhart, who published *The Rebellion of India* in response to Disraeli's July speech. In his pamphlet, Urquhart argued not only that the Mutiny

was the result of Russian instigation, but that the Russians remained in charge once it had begun: "If the next mail from India does not announce that the remnant of the English have been driven into the sea, I shall hold it to be, solely because of the superintending providence of Russia, and the extent and efficiency of the agency she has in time established throughout Hindustan" (20). The fact that he had no tangible evidence for this assertion did not bother him at all, since he claimed to have arrived at it by the surer means of imaginative induction. One suspects that his imaginative powers were aided by England's recent memory of the Crimean and Persian Wars, but despite such a questionable basis for judgment, this argument retained sufficient credibility to come up again during the trial of the King of Delhi, though nothing was ever proven.[22]

Even without adding the complications of a Russian plot, there were a number of writers who attempted to make the vague group of conspirators into a more recognizable picture of a secret society. Certain secret signs and symbols were attributed to the mutineers, including the mysterious circulation among the Bengal troops of *chupatties* (flat cakes of bread) and lotus flowers. Both of these supposed signs to rise were cited by Disraeli in his India speech as evidence that a conspiracy was in place (*Hansard,* 147: 469–71), and many periodical writers followed his lead. Concerning the circulation of *chupatties,* one writer remarked, "Five centuries before, the Chinese had, by a similar plan, organised and carried out a conspiracy by which the dynasty of their Mongol invaders was overthrown; and it now imported no less than the hope and attempt to annihilate the English race in India, and to restore to the effete house of Timour the sovereignty of Hindostan!" ("The Poorbeah Mutiny," 94).[23] A page later the same writer attributed the conspiracy to "the wily Mohammedan," rather than the "the great mass of the Hindoo Sepoy" (95).

G. B. Malleson made his attribution of guilt much more specific in *The Indian Mutiny of 1857,* citing the Maulavi of Faizabad in Oude, Nana Sahib, the Rani of Jhansi and Kunwar Singh as "the executive council of this conspiracy" (33). Malleson's use of the label "executive council" deserves special attention since it draws on the rhetoric of the secret society to identify something akin to the Spinners' "secret select committee" directing the Mutiny. What is especially revealing about his usage is that it demonstrates the ways in which accusations of membership in a secret society continued to stand in for evidence to that effect. The British never ascertained the meaning of the *chupatties,* and the lotus flower incident may never even have occurred. Moreover, even Malleson admits that "Who all of the active conspirators were may probably never be known" (17). Yet he and others felt perfectly comfortable proposing not just a general conspiracy theory, but a more specific outline of something like a secret society at the heart of the Mutiny, suggesting that the figure of the secret society created its own validity simply by being uttered.[24]

The figure of the secret society also enjoyed popular validity because it produced ideological results. The presence of a conspiracy transformed largely ineffectual early British resistance into heroic action by pitting brave individual Englishmen and their women against the vastly arrayed and deeply laid plans of the conspirators. The title of one article in the *Westminster Review,* "Indian Heroes," amply expressed popular sentiment at the time, as did its glowing portrait of the greatness of the British race: "it is in India, during the past twelve months, that our manhood has been put to the severest test, and our ever-living heroism most nobly vindicated. India, for a hundred years the grandest theatre of British enterprise—the glory of modern British genius and valour—has now borne a final testimony to the greatness of our race" (352). This greatness was said to have been proven even by many British military setbacks, from the doomed defense of Cawnpore to the desperate efforts of the besieged British forces at Lucknow, thereby transforming ignominious futility into ideological victory. These energetic attempts to elevate the "manhood" of the British race even in defeat were meant to reflect not only on the inevitability of success in India, but also in any immanent military conflicts in Europe, as the following passage makes clear:

> [T]he handful of heroes and heroines that survived one of the most gallant defences on record were rescued by the exertions of Outram and Havelock and their gallant band, and will finally, it is to be hoped, be avenged by Campbell, but the fame of their endurance and their valour will live for ever. So long as Britain has such blood in her veins, she can laugh to scorn the piratical ardour of a certain party over the water, who are never happy but when planning the invasion and devastation of our small but happy island. ("Oude and the Defence of Lucknow," 418)

The mutiny even generated fictional serials meant to extol British heroism; among them were "The Poorbeah Mutiny" and "The First Bengal European Fusiliers," both of which ran intermittently in *Blackwood's* from January through July, 1858. In an important sense, conspiracy theories made these thrilling tales of British heroism possible.

The figure of the secret society had a much more debilitating effect on non-British Indians. Prior to the Mutiny, there was some hope that through the benevolent guardianship of the British, India might one day emerge from social backwardness and Indians themselves might participate in their own government. Such democratic sentiments were all but abandoned once British victory in the Mutiny was assured. As one reviewer for the *British Quarterly Review* explained,

> The intelligent people of England desire that the natives of India should be treated as justly, considerately, and humanely, as may be possible, but no intelligent man in

> this country thinks that Asiatics can or ought to be governed by *Habeas Corpus* and trial by jury, still less by parochial vestry, and a free press and open discussion. India has always been held by the power of the sword, and must now and for a long time to come be reined in more tightly than ever. . . . People who habitually lie for the pleasure of lying, who cheat for the delight of cheating, and deceive and dissemble for the intense pleasure of deceiving, dissembling, and simulating, can only be kept in order by the strong hand. To use the words of an ancient, the jaws of such a race must be bound fast with bit and bridle. ("The Government of India and the Mutinies," 497)

Sir Erskine Perry of the House of Commons agreed, saying, "No one acquainted with the condition of India could suppose, however, that it was fit for anything like constitutional government. India could only be ruled by despotic power, and English institutions founded upon self-government would be wholly unsuited to such a country" (*Hansard,* 147.510). Even the normally radical *Westminster Review* believed that to "talk of representative institutions for India is mere driveling" ("The English in India," 208). A later article in *The Westminster Review* was somewhat more liberal in that it appeared willing to return to some version of democratic guardianship: "Of the greater Indian powers, it is but natural to be jealous; but the little princes ought to be on every ground fostered by our Government as a cement between us and India, and as the germ of a truly organic inward growth of English principles. And the humbler the relation of these princes to us,—the more they have come in to position of our dependents and *wards*—so much more sacred is the solemn duty of fidelity to them as *guardians*" ("Our Relation to the Princes of India," 461). However, this is democratic guardianship once removed, since the article proposes that England act as guardian not to the people of India directly, but to their petty princes, who are portrayed as children.

For the most part, though, democratic guardianship was no longer viable in India because, if the petty princes were children, the common people were often seen as little better than "fiends and demons, wild with lust, ferocity, and bloodthirstiness" ("Our Indian Empire," *Blackwood's,* 658).[25] Public opinion had come a long way from Indian subjects in training to be proper British citizens, and the figure of the secret society played a significant role in this shift. The specter of a conspiracy behind the Mutiny effectively divided the people of India into two groups, unthinking followers and conspirators. Often, these groups were cast in terms of identity categories, as in the following characterization of the Sepoy troops: "The Hindoo Sepoys were made the dupes and instruments of their more crafty Mussulman comrades" ("The English in India," 197). Most periodical writers agreed on the role of the "crafty Musselman," but there were many who took a less sympathetic view of "the Hindoo Sepoy": "Throughout

his history we find the Hindoo ever the same—ever abject under oppression, submissive to power, rebellious and insolent to weakness; neither tyranny, nor persecution, taxation, nor subjection, could rouse him to resistance or rebellion; no advantages of justice or civilization could ever win or attach him; but the instant that the sceptre grew light or wavering, he was ready to start up, to slay, to ravage, and spoil" ("Our Indian Empire," *Blackwood's,* 650).[26]

Whichever view one adopted, it was clear that neither "Musselman" nor "Hindoo" deserved democratic representation in the government of India. The one was certainly too prone to form secret conspiracies against the Government and the other was either too passive or too savage to govern himself, much less anyone else. Both were effectively sealed within their respective stereotypes by the popular theory that the Mutiny was the result of a conspiratorial group resembling a secret society.[27] The end product of this kind of rhetoric was that the governance of India was formally transferred to the Crown, which would administer it through a Secretary of State and an advisory council of fifteen men—all appointed positions.[28]

II. Initial Literary Reactions and Collins's "Hindoo Conspiracy"

The imperial drama and imperialist ideology generated by the Indian Mutiny prompted an avalanche of imaginative literature in England that dealt either indirectly or directly with Indian themes. As Hilda Gregg wrote in her 1897 retrospective article, "The Indian Mutiny in English Fiction," "Of all the great events of this century, as they are reflected in fiction, the Indian Mutiny has taken the firmest hold on the popular imagination" (218). As evidence for her claim, she offers an impressive list of popular songs, poems, eyewitness accounts and novels written both during and after the Mutiny. Brantlinger adds to Gregg's collection with his capacious survey of Mutiny literature in *Rule of Darkness,* where he asserts that if "a humanist text can be imagined which will break down national, social class, religious, racist, and sexist barriers to understanding, then nearly all nineteenth-century and many twentieth-century accounts of the Mutiny are versions of its antithesis" (200).[29]

Few of these accounts remain in circulation today. Certainly no one still sings "Delhi," "The Highland Rescue," "Jessie's Dream" or "The Havelock March"—all cited by Gregg as current in 1858–59—and there are no contemporary theatrical productions of *The Fall of Delhi* (1857), *India in 1857* (1857), *Keereda and Nana Sahib* (1857), *The Indian Revolt; or, The Relief of Lucknow* (1860), or *Nana Sahib; or, A Story of Aymere* (1863).[30] Likewise, many of the poems and novels inspired by Britain's misadventures in India remain largely unread today; included among this list of forgotten literature are two

attempts at Mutiny epics cited by Gregg—"An Escape from Gwalior" and "The Experiences of an Officer in the Rohilcunde Campaign"—as well as the novels *Maurice Dering* (1864) by George Lawrence, *First Love and Last Love: A Tale of the Indian Mutiny* (1868) by James Grant, and *Stretton* (1869) by Henry Kingsley.[31]

However, some of the early literature inspired by and participating in the racist and imperialist reactions to the Indian Mutiny does remain relatively accessible in the collected works of some of the Victorian Period's best-known writers. Sir George Trevelyan—nephew of Thomas Macaulay, noted historian and future MP—centered his epic and questionably accurate history, *Cawnpore* (1865), for example, around a literary device, the metaphorically resonant Well of Cawnpore.[32] Alfred Tennyson also turned his attention towards the Mutiny, first in "Havelock" (1858), and later in "The Defence of Lucknow" (1879). Both poems extol the bravery of British troops in India and the glory of the British race; this joint obsession with heroism and race is succinctly captured in the closing stanza of "Havelock":

> Bold Havelock died,
> Tender and great and good,
> And every man in Britain
> Says "I am of Havelock's blood!" (13–16)

The awkward slant rhyme of "good" and "blood" exemplifies the kind of racial lessons forced out of British India by many of the early respondents to the Mutiny.

A similar sentiment also emerges from Charles Dickens's early contribution to Mutiny literature in "The Perils of Certain English Prisoners."[33] Co-authored by Dickens and Wilkie Collins for the 1857 Christmas issue of *Household Words,* "Perils" offers a thinly veiled allegory of the Indian Mutiny and one of the first fictional responses to England's Indian crisis.[34] Dickens wrote the first and last chapter of "Perils," a tale set in the British West Indies and narrated by an English soldier, Gill Davis, sent to protect the island of Silver Store from attacks by pirates. The English on the island employ a "native Sambo," Christian George King (the Bengal Army, or possible, Nana Sahib), who, unbeknownst to them, is actually working for the pirates (crafty Musselmen). Although he is unaware of this relationship when he first arrives, Gill Davis still feels a strong aversion toward King, constantly having to suppress the urge to beat him. His opinion of "Natives" in general is not much better: "I have stated myself to be a man of no learning, and, if I entertain prejudices, I hope allowance may be made. I will now confess to one. It may be a right one or it may be a wrong one; but I never did like Natives, except in the form of oysters" (217).

As it turns out, confining one's trust to native oysters might not be a bad idea, since "Christian George King was a double-dyed traitor, and a most infernal villain"

(233), who not only betrays the English colony but participates in the massacre of women and children during the pirate assault that ends chapter one (Cawnpore). In the second, considerably more ambivalent chapter, written by Collins, the English escape the pirate stronghold and raft down the river to freedom. Dickens concludes the story by having these escapees rescued by English marines originally decoyed away from Silver Store through the actions of Christian George King. They return to the island, now vacant of pirates, and kill their mutinous former servant, whose dead body is "left hanging to the tree, all alone, with the red sun making a kind of a dead sunset on his black face" (264). Clearly, this final act of mercy-by-extermination fits in well with other periodical responses to the Mutiny, demonstrating not only that Dickens was aware of the rhetoric surrounding Indian affairs in England, but also that he was not averse to incorporating such rhetoric into his fiction.[35]

This reactionary rhetoric would receive its first serious fictional challenge eleven years later in Wilkie Collins's *The Moonstone*. Written at least in part as a result of the renewed English interest in India prompted by the insurrection at Port Morant, Jamaica in the British West Indies, this founding text of English detective fiction is fairly up-front about its interest in Britain's premier overseas possession: the novel revolves around a stolen Indian diamond which Collins reveals in his Preface to be a composite of a number of sacred Indian stones, including the Koh-i-Noor diamond, a recent addition to the English crown jewels.[36] Through the figure of allegory, Collins links this Indian theme to a rather frank depiction of sexual relations, represented in the novel as a double for the imperial relationship between England and India. This fictional strategy of doubling reappears throughout *The Moonstone,* combining with Collins's strategic deployment of the figure of the secret society to promote sympathy for India and, by extension, for the Indian Mutiny.

The allegory of female sexuality expressed by the theft of Rachel's jewel is accessible through a simple plot summary, and is less directly relevant to my project than the ways in the novel slips into more imperial registers through the strong presence of Indian elements in the story.[37] The jewel is an Indian jewel, originally brought to England by Colonel John Herncastle, Rachel's uncle, who acquired it during the siege of Seringapatam. In this, the primal scene of the novel, Herncastle breaks into the armoury, takes the jewel, and murders three Indian guards with his dagger, which he holds "dripping with blood" when the narrator of this original scene first sees him (Prologue 5).[38] Herncastle is referred to throughout the book as "the Honourable John,"[39] a title also applied to both John Company (the British East India Company) and John Bull (Britain), further reinforcing the imperial overtones of his theft. To add to this Indian atmosphere, the cabinet in which Rachel places the jewel is an Indian cabinet. Moreover, Blake steals the jewel while under the influence of

opium, which was perhaps the most well known export from British India.[40] Finally, he performs this initial theft in order to protect the Moonstone from a group of Indian conspirators, really high-caste Brahmins, dedicated to returning the jewel to India.[41] As Jenny Bourne Taylor argues, Collins's inclusion of these Indian details in a novel written during a period of renewed interest in the Indian Mutiny suggests that he is self-consciously going "against the grain of the prevailing representation of 'India' as extreme signifier of savage violence" in order to foster a less exclusively condemnatory attitude towards India and a more critical stance on Britain's imperial policy (194).

Collins's choice of dates is particularly significant to this effort at fostering sympathy. Rather than set the novel during the years of the Mutiny, which would have almost certainly predisposed his audience to take up an extreme position of condemnation, Collins, in the words of Jaya Mehta, "deliberately predates the novel so that any historic reference to the insurrection is impossible. Instead, the colonial event that inaugurates the mystery is the 1799 Siege of Seringapatam, a siege not *of* British troops but *by* British troops" (618).[42] In addition, Rachel's birthday party and the theft of the diamond takes place in 1848, the year not only of European revolutions and Chartist agitation, but also of Britain's conquest of the Punjab in India. Finally, the Orientalist, Mr. Murthwaite's, final letter concerning the fate of the Moonstone is dated 1850, the same year that the Koh-i-Noor diamond mentioned in Collins's Preface was presented to Queen Victoria; Murthwaite writes, "There, raised high on a throne—seated on his typical antelope, with his four arms stretching towards the four corners of the earth—there, soared above us, dark and awful in the mystic light of heaven, the god of the Moon. And there, in the forehead of the deity, gleamed the yellow Diamond, whose splendour had last shone on me in England from the bosom of a woman's dress!" (Epilogue iii.521). Hence the novel begins with imperial brutality on the part of "the Honourable John," and then proceeds to invert two important dates in the history of British India by making 1848 and 1850 years of British loss, not British gain. Moreover, these later losses are made the direct result of the first imperial gain, and, in fact, the novel suggests that in 1850 the Moonstone has returned to its rightful place out of British hands.[43] In other words, the dating of the novel subtly encourages readers to stop seeing India through the English lens of the Mutiny and to start perceiving it by the Indian light of the Moonstone.

In addition to the use of allusive dating, Collins also employs a more characteristically Dickensian technique of doubling in order to effect this shift in his readers' perception. His most productive efforts in this direction surround the three Indian Brahmins dedicated to recovering the Moonstone for Indian worship. These men originally appear in the text as dangerous agents of reverse-colonization, members of a foreign conspiracy whose portrayal draws on the rhetoric of the secret society in

order to further estrange them from English readers. However, as the novel progresses, they become more sympathetic figures whose actions and attitudes double those of the novel's English characters. This technique of doubling not only elevates the Indians, it also diminishes the English, until, at the end of the of the novel, the three Brahmins and their agents can commit murder and still appear as legitimate agents of the restoration of order in *The Moonstone*.

The initial representation of the Indians as potentially dangerous and wholly foreign occurs primarily in the ten chapters leading up to the theft of the Moonstone, making the three Brahmins prime suspects in the eyes of the reader. Information about them almost always comes at second-hand, escalating in severity as these early chapters progress. They make a brief first appearance in person before Gabriel Betteridge, who judges them to be "strolling conjurors" with suspiciously superior manners (I.i.3.17), and tells them to leave. After they do so, his daughter Penelope supplements this first impression with a curious tale of the Indians practicing clairvoyance by mesmerizing a young English boy and searching for an "English gentleman from foreign parts" possessed of a mysterious "It" on the road where Franklin Blake is scheduled to appear (I.i.3.19–20). Though he initially dismisses these actions as mere "hocus-pocus" to his daughter (I.i.3.20), in his position as narrator Betteridge warns the reader that "you won't find the ghost of a joke in our conversation on the subject of the jugglers" (I.i.3.21), whose unnatural control over one English subject and interest in another is made potentially sinister due to its connection to the narrative of the Moonstone. This connection is strengthened by the early appearance of Blake, who tells Betteridge, "'I have been followed, and watched in London, for the last three of four days; and I have travelled by the morning instead of the afternoon train, because I wanted to give a certain dark-looking stranger the slip'" (I.i.5.30).

Primed by Betteridge's narrative hint, the reader is moved to accept Blake's otherwise unsupported and vaguely racist assertion, "'that my stranger and your three jugglers may turn out to be pieces of the same puzzle'" (I.i.5.30). From street performers to spies, the Indians slip a bit further in the reader's estimation when Blake tells Betteridge of the possible presence of "'A plot organised among the Indians who originally owned the jewel . . . a plot with some old Hindoo superstition at the bottom of it'" (I.i.6.42). That such Hindoo religious plots can be dangerous is revealed by "the celebrated Indian traveller, Mr. Murthwaite," who, upon seeing Rachel with the Moonstone displayed in her bosom, warns her that "'An Indian diamond is sometimes part of a Hindoo religion. I know a certain city, and a certain temple in that city, where, dressed as you are now, your life would not be worth five minutes' purchase'" (I.i.10.73).

Murthwaite is also responsible for justifying the reader's growing conviction that this Hindoo plot and the mysterious Indian jugglers are one and the same. They make

another brief appearance, this time at Rachel's birthday party, from which they quickly depart at a word from Murthwaite. After they have gone, he, Blake and Betteridge reconvene in the garden, where he reveals that the jugglers are actually high-caste Brahmins in disguise. Subtly invoking the issue of caste so central to the greased cartridges fiasco, Murthwaite expresses some puzzlement at why the Indians would be thus disguised in England, since doing so means that "They have doubly sacrificed their caste" (I.i.10.79). Upon learning the history of the diamond, his puzzlement disappears and he firmly connects these disguised Brahmins with the plot to recover the Moonstone. Further, he reiterates his earlier warning of Hindoo plots in stronger terms, cautioning Betteridge and Blake, "In the country those men came from, they care just as much about killing a man, as you care about emptying the ashes out of your pipe. If a thousand lives stood between them and the getting back of their Diamond—and if they thought they could destroy those lives without discovery—they would take them all. The sacrifice of caste is a serious thing in India, if you like. The sacrifice of life is nothing at all" (I.i.10.81).

This final connection of the Indians with murder occurs in the chapter immediately prior to the theft of the Moonstone, which now seems well within their purview as, in Betteridge's words, superstitious "murdering thieves" (I.i.10.81). Up to this point, Collins's portrayal of dangerous Hindoo Brahmins who have lost their caste and are acting on the basis of religious superstition to recover an Indian jewel in British possession appears very similar to the rhetoric surrounding the Indian Mutiny. However, even though he has done more than any other character to establish this congruity, Murthwaite does not share Betteridge's conclusions about it; in fact, he believes that the Indians are "a wonderful people" (I.i.10.81).

Murthwaite's opinion notwithstanding, at this point in the novel most Victorian readers were apt to share Betteridge's view, especially since Collins carefully represents the Indians using the figure of the secret society. Not only do they engage in ritual and occult practices like clairvoyance, but they are also repeatedly referred to as engaged in a "plot" or "conspiracy," words calculated to evoke strong reader emotion when coupled with recent memories of the Indian Mutiny. Once again, it is Murthwaite who adds crucial evidence that the three Indian jugglers are more than they seem, that they are in fact members of what he refers to as "this modest little Indian organization" (II.ii.3.315). His proof of this assertion is largely contained in a letter left for the Indians while they are being detained in the local prison; it reads as follows:

> "In the name of the Regent of the Night, whose seat is on the Antelope, whose arms embrace the four corners of the earth.
>
> "Brothers, turn your faces to the south, and come to me in the street of many noises,

which leads down to the muddy river.
"The reason is this.
"My own eyes have seen it." (II.ii.3.320)

The letter is not strictly in code, though it was written originally in Hindustani to insure that most Englishmen could not read it, but its veiled reference to the Moonstone is obviously meant to be deciphered by an insider. Further, since the letter comes to the Indians while they are in prison, it suggests a wider network of organization than they have yet shown. In other words, like the circulation of the *chupatties,* the letter allows the novel's characters to imagine a widespread and well-organized conspiracy only the edges of which they have been allowed to see. Such evocations of the figure of the secret society work to distance the Indians, to render them suspicious and dangerous prime suspects in the theft of the diamond.

However, even if they did take the diamond from Rachel Verinder's room—which, it turns out, they did not—the Indians have at least the excuse that it had been stolen from them first. They are doubles of Rachel in this respect, and this initial act of doubling not only begins to make them seem less exclusively aggressive foreigners, it also begins to show the imperial underpinnings of the Verinder family. The Indians are actually doubled in several ways by different members of the novel's cast. Gabriel Betteridge offers the most humorous example of doubling with his repeated acts of Crusoemancy; indeed, his narrative, and therefore the entire story of the Moonstone, begins with just such a consultation of Defoe:

In the first part of *Robinson Crusoe,* at page one hundred and twenty-nine, you will find it thus written:

"Now I saw, though too late, the Folly of beginning a Work before we count the Cost, and before we judge rightly of our own Strength to go through with it."

Only yesterday, I opened my *Robinson Crusoe* at that place. Only this morning (May twenty-first, Eighteen hundred and fifty), came my lady's nephew, Mr. Franklin Blake . . .

Two hours have passed since Mr. Franklin left me. As soon as his back was turned, I went to my writing desk to start the story. There I have sat helpless (in spite of my abilities) ever since; seeing what Robinson Crusoe saw, as quoted above—namely, the folly of beginning a work before we count the cost, and before we judge rightly of our own strength to go through with it. Please to remember, I opened the book by accident, at that bit, only the day before I rashly undertook the business now in hand; and, allow me to ask—if *that* isn't prophesy, what is? (I.i.1.7–8)[44]

One might answer that Betteridge's reliance on the mysterious advice of *Robinson Crusoe* looks less like prophesy and more like the Indians' acts of clairvoyance. Moreover, Betteridge's version of mumbo-jumbo places the story of the Moonstone squarely within the colonial context of the Prologue by quoting from the prototypical novel of English imperialism. It also renders imperialism every bit as irrationally superstitious as the Hindoo conspiracy to recover the diamond, since Betteridge's valorization of Defoe's text resembles nothing so much as religious devotion.[45]

Clairvoyance also provides a point of contact between the Indians and the man most responsible for proving Blake's innocence of the theft, Ezra Jennings. Responding to Jennings's description of the opium experiment he plans to perform on Franklin Blake, the lawyer, Mr. Bruff, writes, "It was quite unintelligible to *his* mind, except that it looked like a piece of trickery, akin to the trickery of mesmerism, clairvoyance, and the like" (II.iv.6/18.445).[46] In addition to the practice of a type of clairvoyance, Jennings shares a number of other characteristics with the Indian conspirators, and these similarities help to render them more sympathetic. Like the Indians, Jennings's outlandish appearance works against him:

> Judging him by his figure and his movements, he was still young. Judging him by his face, and comparing him with Betteridge, he looked the elder of the two. His complexion was of a gipsy darkness; his fleshless cheeks had fallen into deep hollows, over which the bone projected like a penthouse. His nose presented the fine shape and modelling so often found among the ancient people of the East, so seldom visible among the newer races of the West. . . . Add to this a quantity of thick closely-curling hair, which, by some freak of Nature, had lost its colour in the most startlingly partial and capricious manner. (II.iii.4.358)

It is no wonder that Dr. Candy's patients feel a bit of trepidation when being treated by a doctor's assistant who looks so unhealthy himself. However, their negative reaction is likely due as much to Jennings's foreign aspect as anything else: his "gipsy darkness," Eastern nose, and non-Anglo-Saxon hair. Coupled with his birth in the colonies and deliberately ambiguous racial ancestry, Jennings's appearance makes him a credible double for the Indians.[47] As the only foreigner allowed to speak for himself in the text, Jennings also helps to overcome his and the Indians' suspicious appearance by exemplifying a number of qualities highly prized by the novel's English characters. Blake describes him as exhibiting "the *unsought self-possession,* which is a sure sign of good breeding, not in England only, but everywhere else in the civilized world" (II.iii.9.410), and he displays this quality, along with sensitivity, intelligence, energy, forthright honesty, and discretion, during the opium-induced reenactment of the theft.[48] In fact, he is so successful in thus embodying English manly virtue that he wins over both

Bruff and Betteridge by the end of the experiment (II.iv.6/25.2am.476). Given Jennings's success at overcoming the initial repulsion occasioned by his appearance, one is left wondering whether or not the Indians would have done the same if allowed to represent themselves.[49]

Even without being able to speak for themselves, however, the Indians do accrue a certain amount of respectability from the fact that their practice of secrecy is curiously mirrored by the Verinder household during the initial police investigation. As D. A. Miller observes in his groundbreaking reading of *The Moonstone,* Sergeant Cuff's attempts at detection are repeatedly frustrated and eventually stymied altogether by different household members' appeals to "insider" knowledge: they know that, despite Cuff's impressive collection of evidence, Rachel did not take the diamond because they know Rachel and they know that she is not capable of theft. Miller argues that this appeal to insider information eventually displaces the detective function onto the family, replacing the role of the detective with a more universal function of detection.[50] One might also say that the family's frustration and expulsion of Cuff allows for a subtle slippage from protecting the family's privacy to practicing the family's secrecy.[51] In fact, the reason that the truth is not immediately known is that Rachel secrets her knowledge that Blake took the stone, thereby allowing Godfrey Ablewhite to preserve his secret that he took it from Blake. Moreover, the family's respectability can only be preserved by keeping the secret for a further two years, allowing Blake to accumulate the necessary documents to vindicate himself in the face of public rumor-mongering. Such an assiduous practice of secrecy allows the Verinder family to serve as a double for the Indian conspiracy, and this doubling of the Indians and the family further makes the novel's Hindoo conspiracy seem much more familiar, and therefore much more acceptable.

The final factor that allows the Indians to be transformed from dangerous foreign conspirators to agents of order is Collins's active advertisement of the presence of English criminality. This criminality is evident in the actions of the "Honourable John" Herncastle at Seringapatam, certainly, but it also extends to the rest of the family. Immediately after the theft of the diamond in 1848, for example, the family arranges to have the Indians detained by the local magistrate under questionable legal circumstances; as Betteridge the narrator puts it, "Every human institution (Justice included) will stretch a little, if you only pull it the right way" (I.i.11.93), and the Verinders are not above a little stretching when they deem it necessary. Rachel's cousin, Godfrey Ablewhite, goes far beyond such simple stretching, however, living a double life that allows him to be at once "the most accomplished philanthropist (on a small independence) that England ever produced" (I.i.8.60), as well as a thief, a mercenary suitor, and a fraudulent executor.

What makes his double life significant not just for himself, but also for his coun-

try, is that Ablewhite appears as the personal representative of what writers on the Mutiny would have called the "English race": "He stood over six feet high; he had a beautiful red and white color; a smooth face, shaved as bare as your hand; and a head of lovely flaxen hair, falling negligently over the poll of his neck. . . . He was a barrister by profession; a ladies' man by temperament; and a good Samaritan by choice" (I.i.8.60). Subsequent revelations of Ablewhite's misdeeds stain this initial portrait of idealized whiteness until, at the end of the novel, he assumes the disguise of a dark-complexioned sailor while on the run from the Indians. Despite this change of appearance, however, they still see him for who he really is and smother him in his sleep, leaving Sergeant Cuff to dramatically unmask the whiteness of the corpse underneath (II.v.1.498).

III. Conclusions

Despite its anti-imperial leanings, Collins's novel appears to reestablish a social order that is distinctly conservative. Betteridge's concluding section of the narrative proper ends where it had begun, proclaiming the virtues of *Robinson Crusoe*. This time, though, Betteridge gets his characters straight, correctly assigning the role of Crusoe to the newly married Blake, who finally accepts the prophetic relevance of England's founding colonial novel to modern life. In addition, Murthwaite's last letter, while it endorses the return of the Moonstone to its shrine in India, also reestablishes the appropriate colonial relationship between England and India by placing Indian life back in its place as the appropriate object of British observation. Finally, the Hindoo conspiracy is formally dissolved when the three Brahmins depart in separate directions, without speaking a word, having to rely on their cultural guardian, Murthwaite, to tell their side of the story.

However, Collins's apparent return to the status quo at the end of *The Moonstone* cannot efface the novel's more radically anti-imperial implications. The final act of Ablewhite's unmasking, for example, has important implications for the images of the Indians and the English that emerge from Collins's novel. For the Indians, the act of murder paradoxically aligns their "Hindoo conspiracy" on the side of law and order—the side occupied during the Mutiny by English Freemasons—since it is only through Ablewhite's death that the full extent of his misdeeds come to light and that Blake is finally exonerated, resulting in his marriage to Rachel and the reestablishment of English domestic tranquility. For the English, the family is not what it once was: Lady Verinder is dead, the Ablewhites have suffered the disgrace and death of their eldest son, and the family's dirty laundry has been aired for all to read. Moreover, the family's connections to "the Honourable John" have revealed an imperial base

for domesticity, which itself appears as a cover for English criminality. As a reflection on the Mutiny, then, *The Moonstone* issues a challenge to earlier racist and imperialist responses to the rebellion by literally revealing that at work behind the dark mask of disorder and death is the white face of England.

Admitting some English responsibility for the Indian Mutiny goes a long way towards bridging the gap between English and Indian that the initial rhetoric surrounding the rebellion had sought to establish. Moreover, the suggestion in Collins's novel that secrecy may be practiced as readily by English heroes as it is by revolutionary villains undercuts the rhetoric of Carlylean heroism underwriting British representations of the Mutiny. *The Moonstone* even goes so far as to suggest that the Hindoo conspirators may themselves be a type of Carlylean hero, perpetual prophets who surrender their social status in the service of their beliefs, and in so doing become agents of social order. This capacity for self-sacrifice allows them to share the moral and racial superiority supposedly conferred on the English by the Indian Mutiny. Read in a democratic context, this final image of the Indians suggests that they and other "dark races" under colonial rule have always already been equal to their democratic guardians.

5

Italian Union: Red Republicanism, *The Woman in White* and *Lothair*

Only months after the last vestiges of armed resistance had been put down in India, England found itself uneasily on the fringe of an imperial conflict much closer to home. The Italian state of Piedmont, aided by Napoleon III, declared war on the Austrian Empire and began the lengthy process of reuniting the nation of Italy. This process brought to light an Italian Question that had been simmering in the background of Continental politics for several years. During the Crimean War, Piedmont had advertised its aspirations to European prominence by joining the British and the French in their fight to contain imperial Russia and preserve the balance of power in eastern Europe. Afterwards, Austria had sought unsuccessfully to exclude Piedmont from treaty negotiations, despite the fact that the British-French-Piedmontese side had essentially secured Austria's eastern border. Two years later, a failed assassination attempt on Napoleon III by the Italian revolutionary Orsini, who was operating from England, prompted Parliamentary debate over the Conspiracy Bill, which would have made such plots against foreign sovereigns punishable under English law. At the same time, as at least one article on the Indian Mutiny in *Bentley's Miscellany,* "Oude and the Defence of Lucknow," demonstrated, France was preparing for a major military campaign, and many in England feared a channel crossing.

However, this historical background only begins to explain why the combined French-Piedmontese invasion of Austrian Venetia in 1859 began a massive outpouring of periodical anxiety in England that lasted for the next eleven years. For English periodical writers, Italian unification raised a host of complex ideological problems, not the least of which was how to reconcile widespread antipathy towards Napoleon III with his involvement in a revolutionary process that many hoped would

succeed. A united Italy had the potential to both check the political and military power of France and Austria and arrest the temporal power of the Pope, not to mention provide greater access to the Mediterranean for English shipping. Such hopes had to be carefully managed, however, since actively supporting Italian unification at the expense of the Austrian Empire would place Britain in the uncomfortable position of espousing a policy of separation for others while vehemently opposing such separation within itself, whether in India or Ireland.

Making the situation even more difficult was the presence of numerous secret societies throughout the Italian peninsula. Activated by Napoleon I's conquest of Italy at the beginning of the century, groups like the Federati, the Guelphi, the Adelphi, the Latini, and especially the Carbonari all strove for an independent Italy under a constitutional government.[1] On the one hand, these associations made Italian independence seem like a dangerous proposition: for the most part, Italian secret societies espoused radical political goals and many appeared suspiciously similar to the newly formed Fenian Brotherhood in Ireland.[2] Moreover, as the Orsini plot demonstrated, these groups were not above employing violence to achieve their goals. On the other hand, many Italian secret societies had been formed on the model of English Freemasonry, and many of their most prominent members, including Garibaldi, were actually Masons as well. However, even Garibaldi was connected with ties of friendship to the Italian radical republican, Giuseppe Mazzini, placing his political opinions in doubt. Mazzini lived as an expatriate in London, where he promulgated the red republican doctrines of his Young Italy movement in English periodicals, generating both sympathy and hostility among their readers while keeping Italian affairs firmly before them. Faced with such a bewildering array of political affiliations, secretive practices, and red republicanism, many Englishmen did not know how they ought to respond to the Italian Question.

This consciousness on the part of English writers of the ideological conflicts inherent in the Italian Question in part aligns the English response to Italian unification with earlier debates over Glasgow Thuggery, Papal aggression and the Indian Mutiny. The issues of class and public assembly so present during the Spinners' trial resurface in connection to Italian affairs whenever Italy's poor gather together to vote on the future of unification. Likewise, the question of religion fueling England's recent history of anti-Catholicism informs some writers' responses to the Pope's presence on the Italian peninsula and his increasing advocacy of ultra-montane doctrine. In addition, questions about the Italian race and its fitness for self-government echo English rhetoric surrounding the Indian Mutiny. However, the Italian Question also differs from these earlier problematics in a number of crucial ways. First, one cannot help but notice the sheer number of ideological positions available to English writers seeking to understand unification, or the stress that this cacophony of ideologies places

on any attempt to advance an ideologically "pure" view of Italian affairs. Questions of class were complicated by the presence of Piedmont's royal family in the drive towards unification; Italians' almost universal adherence to Catholicism made it difficult to separate them on religious grounds from the Pope, whom they nevertheless wanted to remove from a position of secular authority; the Italian race, for all of its stereotypical emotion, was still European and therefore theoretically suited to self-rule; the question of Italian self-rule remained uncomfortably close to Irish nationalist impulses; and so on. In order to craft a response to the Italian Question, one had to practice a kind of ideological relativism, balancing politics, trade, class, religion, and race and occluding the conflicts among them.

Some of the complexity of these competing ideologies appeared resolved in 1861, when the Italian Parliament assembled at Turin to elect Victor Emmanuel II King of Italy, minus Rome and Venetia. These territorial omissions, combined with the decision to make Italy a constitutional monarchy, reassured most Englishmen that by supporting Italian unification they would no longer be directly fomenting the breakup of the Austrian Empire or the spread of radical democracy. The political terms of the Italian Question shifted from opposing Austria's occupation of Venetia to spreading limited parliamentary reform throughout Italy, and once supporting the Italian cause meant parliamentary institutions, monarchical authority and national unity, English public opinion grew much less anxious, since Piedmontizing Naples was a lot like Anglicizing Ireland.

However, just because the political terms of the Italian Question had grown more attractive in England did not mean that the issue of secrecy had been similarly resolved. Italy continued to serve as the ideal location for frantic invocations of the figure of the secret society, and English support for a united Italy tacitly embroiled England in this ubiquity of secretive practices. England's apparent complicity in the continued presence of Italy's secret societies resulted in a confusion of the rhetoric surrounding the figure of the secret society, with some English periodicals denouncing the influence of groups like the Carbonari and others supporting, for example, Garibaldi's clandestine military campaigns against the Pope. This lack of ideological consensus over the ubiquitous issue of Italian secrecy provides a useful index of the larger collapse of "ideological purity" that occurred in responses to the Italian Question. A slippage into ideological relativism had already been present in earlier debates over the character of England's emerging democracy—as my previous chapters have attempted to show—but during this period of Italian unification, such relativism became apparent to an unparalleled degree.

Two literary texts that appeared during the messy resolution of the Italian Question reflect this ideologically compromised subtext in their deployments of the figure of the secret society. Wilkie Collins's *The Woman in White,* originally published

in 1859–60 during the first period of Italian unification, represents English ambivalence towards implicitly Italian practices of secrecy using many of the same methods we have already seen in *The Moonstone:* allusive dating; repeated instances of doubling; and a secret society whose murderous actions help to restore narrative order. Collins also reinforces the extra-political attractiveness of the figure of the secret society through the character of Count Fosco, an Italian conspirator and arch-villain who nevertheless remains one of the most charismatic figures in the novel. Published in 1870, the same year that Italian unification was finally achieved and that Papal infallibility was declared, Benjamin Disraeli's *Lothair* offers an explicit reexamination of the figure of the secret society in the context of Italian affairs. The novel presents Italy and England as overflowing with the conspiratorial machinations of an explosion of factual and fictional secret societies, the institutional practices of which allow Disraeli to self-consciously interrogate the figurative role of such organizations in both countries. Ultimately, both texts deploy a rhetoric of secrecy that dialectically tacks between valorization and condemnation, thereby locating the figure of the secret society at the center of England's conflicted responses to the Italian Question, and, by extension, to the related subjects of nationalism and imperialism more generally.

I. Red Republicanism and *The Woman in White*

The first two years of Italian unification began the consolidation of the Italian states under the rule of Piedmont's King Victor Emmanuel II and witnessed the elevation of Garibaldi to heroic status.[3] After a secret meeting held in January of 1859 between Piedmont's Prime Minister Count Cavour and French Emperor Napoleon III, Austria—then the dominant power in northern Italy—was goaded into war with Franco-Italian troops. Among these soldiers was a small volunteer regiment, the *Cacciatori del Alpi* [Alpine Chasseurs], led by Garibaldi, who proved to be one of the most successful of Italy's military commanders. Despite Garibaldi's efforts, however, the Austrians were winning until fighting abruptly ceased on 11 July with the signing of the Villafranca armistice between Austria and France.[4] The terms of this peace, about which they were not consulted, left many Italians feeling betrayed: Austria was to keep Venetia, while the states of Sardinia and Lombardy, both of which had demonstrated a desire to join Piedmont, were made "independent."

Officially, the state of Piedmont could do nothing against the combined military forces of Austria and France; unofficially, however, Garibaldi embarked on a mission of unification. Gathering together a thousand volunteer troops, popularly known as the Red Shirts, he invaded Sardinia. Once there, he provided military support for a popular rebellion against the island's illiberal government. The rebellion quickly

succeeded and Sardinia immediately renewed the pledge of allegiance to Piedmont it had extended during the brief war with Austria. From Sardinia, Garibaldi next led his swollen volunteer ranks into the island half of the kingdom of the Two Sicilies and began to support/incite another popular rebellion, this time against the ruling Bourbon government. By late July, he had forced the Bourbons to abandon nearly all of the island of Sicily, which he claimed for Victor Emmanuel. He then moved into the mainland component of the Two Sicilies and quickly gained control of Naples on 7 September 1860. The rest of southern Italy followed and in October a popular election indicated overwhelming support for annexation by Piedmont-Sardinia.

At the same time Victor Emmanuel and Count Cavour signed a treaty ceding Savoy and the city of Nice, Garibaldi's birthplace, to France in order to prevent French troops from marching in to "restore order" to the peninsula. Not surprisingly, Garibaldi was displeased that others were reducing the size of Italy while he was enlarging it, and so there was a brief time when it seemed as if he might retain control of the southern peninsula himself and march on Rome, despite the fact that Napoleon III was pressing Piedmontese leaders to make the Pope interim head of the Italian state. Since Rome was supported almost entirely by French troops, this plan would have made Napoleon III the de facto leader of Italy. However, Victor Emmanuel solved both problems by marching an Italian army through the Papal States in order to personally secure Garibaldi's allegiance to the throne. This act added not only the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies but also much of the Romagna to the now greatly enlarged state of Piedmont, leaving only Rome and its immediate surroundings in the hands of the Pope.[5]

This quick succession of plot and counter-plot in Italy made many English periodical writers very uncomfortable. Most of them supported a united Italy in principle—Italy not only made political sense as a check to France, it also emotionally appealed to the many well-to-do Englishmen who had traveled to the peninsula while on their Grand Tour—but were not as enthusiastic about the practices required for unification. The role of France in the whole process remained very troublesome for a number of writers. As one article stated, "we cannot, and we dare not, overlook the fact that France is arming to the teeth, ready by sea or land for some new aggressive design" ("France and Central Italy," 252).[6] Napoleon III was often portrayed in the English press as a schemer who was not above manipulating his allies for his own advantage, as he had done to the Piedmontese at Villafranca. Moreover, his newly enlarged army and navy made his political acumen all the more dangerous, since he could attack those who did not agree to his policies.

Among those policies particularly unattractive in England was his attempt to make the Pope the ruler of a united Italy. Not only would this move elevate Napoleon, it would also increase the temporal authority of the Papacy, a fear very much alive in

England since the restoration of the Roman Catholic hierarchy there in 1850.[7] As one *Blackwood's* writer remarked, "The history of modern Europe sufficiently shows the incompatibility of papal and priestly domination with civil rights and political progress" ("Italy: Her Nationality or Dependence," 356), and a later article agreed, asserting that "the two characters of Catholic priest and civil magistrate ought not to be combined in the same person" ("The Papal Government," 396). The figure of Jesuitism, never very far away in English anti-Catholic rhetoric, also appeared several times in support of this opposition to Papal rule in Italy.[8] More might have been made of this evocation of the figure of Jesuitism, had not Victor Emmanuel's march through Romagna demonstrated the Italians' shared desire to reduce the Pope's temporal authority.

Despite such promising displays of liberal sentiment by the Piedmontese leadership, a number of English writers recognized that they could not legitimately support Italy's designs on Lombardy and Venetia without violating Britain's own imperial policy. Most recently demonstrated by Britain's military suppression of the Indian Mutiny, this policy might also be seen in a less dramatic form anywhere in the Empire. It was approvingly summarized and related to the Italian Question by one writer for the *Edinburgh Review* in the following terms:

> Of all the sovereigns now filling a throne, Queen Victoria is undoubtedly the ruler of the largest number of subject races, alien populations, and discordant tongues. . . . But above and around them all stands that majestic edifice, raised by the valour and authority of England, which connects these scattered dependencies with one great Whole infinitely more powerful, more civilized, and more free than any separate fragment could be; and it is to the subordination of national or provincial independence that the true citizenship of these realms owes its existence. . . . [I]t is the glory of England to have constituted such an empire, and to govern it, in the main, on just and tolerant principles, as long as her imperial rights are not assailed; when they are assailed, the people of England have never shown much forebearance in the defence of them. Such being the fact, it is utterly repugnant to the first principles of our own policy, and to every page in our history, to lend encouragement to that separation of nationalities from other empires which we fiercely resist when it threatens our own. ("Austria, France, and Italy," 564–65)

Ireland provided an especially sensitive illustration of imperial policy in action, and a number of writers recognized clear parallels between England's possession of its western neighbor and Austria's occupation of northeast Italy. One *Blackwood's* author compared the role of Napoleon III in the unification process to "our own O'Connell, in his notorious addresses to Irish mobs" ("Italy: Her Nationality or Dependence,"

352), and another writer went so far as to describe Ireland as England's Lombardy ("Austrian Italy," 307). Despite this imperial outlook, however, English writers were quick to dismiss one instance of empire building—France's annexation of Nice and Savoy—as flagrant coercion and an excellent example of the abuses to which universal suffrage could be susceptible: "We have nothing to say in favour of the farce of universal suffrage, such as we have seen it in Savoy and Nice; nor could we, in full recognition of the Ionian Islands, of India, and of Ireland some years ago, easily maintain that the government of a country ought always to depend upon the popular voice" ("The Sicilian Game," 552). For this author, as for many others, guardianship, whether democratic or aristocratic, was the only appropriate way to govern a colony.

This support in England for various forms of guardianship made those who advocated radical republican principles for Italy even worse than Napoleon and the Pope. The most prominent figure in Italy's republican movement was Giuseppe Mazzini, expatriate revolutionary and leader of the Young Italy Movement. Founded by Mazzini in 1831, Young Italy was guided by three central principles: Republicanism, or radical democracy; Unitarianism, or the eventual unification of all of Italy, including Venetia and Rome; and Independence, or the complete elimination of international interference in Italy's domestic policy. These principles were expanded upon on the organization's flag, which bore the words Liberty, Equality, Humanity, Unity, and Independence, and internally enforced via the oath of alliance and secrecy required of its members. For many in England, Mazzini's principles and practices in Young Italy far too closely resembled the radical republicanism of the French Revolution, not to mention the increasingly dangerous separatist movement at work in Ireland. Moreover, there was a brief moment—when Mazzini's longtime friend, Garibaldi, still held control of southern Italy—during which it appeared as if these principles and practices would be actualized in an Italian state.

Several English writers responded to this ultra-democratic possibility by representing Mazzini's red republicanism using the figure of the secret society. Mazzini himself was described in the English press as the "apostle of revolution and conspiracy" and "the very genius of conspiracy" ("The Sicilian Game," 553; "The Italian Question," 246). His republican followers were similarly disparaged as "that most deadly of Italian difficulties, the party of systematic and reckless revolution . . . a secret and yet avowed party of miscalled patriots, but rather of unscrupulous murderers, who take Sicilian Vespers and the massacre of Saint Bartholomew for their historic models" ("Italy: Her Nationality or Dependence," 364). Despite their efforts to keep alive "the lamp of liberal aspirations" following the failure of the 1848 revolutions, the fact that they had done so "clandestinely" made their intentions open to question ("The Italian Question," 255).[9] Another article described them as "passionate, prejudiced

and unjust," and went on to criticize their divisive potential at a time of crisis: "The jealousies, impatience, and violence of these men produce a division in the ranks of Italian patriots regrettable in any case, and which might become dangerous if the march of events were likely to be less rapid; and, despite the sympathy which may be felt for them personally, it is absolutely necessary that the government should neither permit its plans to be interfered with, nor its authority to be set at naught, by them" ("The Situation of the Moment in Italy," 489). For some Englishmen, no action seemed beyond the reach of these radical conspirators, and one writer even implicated Mazzini and Orsini in a plot to make 80 "Brothers" in Milan swear an oath that they would carry out a conspiracy to assassinate an unnamed number of Austrian army officers ("Italy: Her Nationality or Dependence," 364–65).

Mazzini and the republicans were also represented using the more specific figure of the Carbonari. Paying Mazzini a backhanded compliment for his role in the revolutions of 1848, one writer observed,

> Mazzini was powerful in 1848 for the best of reasons: he had done immense services, greater than those of any other man, in keeping alive the torch of liberal ideas in a period of desolation and gloom. . . . When, therefore, the great movement came overnight . . . enthusiastic confidence was elicited for the prophetic nature of the man, whose hierophantic breathings, communicated at midnight meetings in the mystic conclaves of Carbonari lodges, had quickened the generous devotion of youth, had buoyed up with fevered assurance the despondency of maturer years, had been sufficient to make noble lives seek voluntary martyrdom, in obedience to whispered bidding. ("The Italian Question," 246)

Only a page later, the same author accounted for the decline in such hierophantic "Mazzinianism" by declaring that political action in Italy no longer required "the mummeries of Carbonari lodges" (247). Mazzini's secretive political practices had thus become obsolete in a liberal modern state such as Piedmont, despite the fact that these practices had been successful at securing "generous devotion" and even "voluntary martyrdom"; one suspects that the real danger of Mazzinian secrecy was its familiar attraction for those in England who were already inclined to valorize groups like the Masons. This kind of attitude towards the republicans was widespread and reflected the same ambivalence toward secret societies that had surfaced in the Glasgow spinners' trial and the more recent debate over English Catholicism.

Even periodical writers otherwise friendly to Mazzini and the republican cause had to admit that "the politicians of Europe . . . have been accustomed to connect the ideas of unbridled licence, Red Republicanism, Carbonarism, societies of assassination and brigandage, with the very name of a popular movement in Italy" (Lushington,

"The Crisis of Italian Freedom," 60).[10] The popular movement was further linked with the Carbonari in "Papers on the Italian Question," an article in *The North British Review* that connected Orsini's failed assassination attempt on Napoleon III with the Carbonari and hence with Mazzini and the republican cause.

This association of Mazzini and Young Italy with "the mummeries of Carbonari lodges" was calculated to generate as much hostility as possible towards the radical republican element of Italian unification by drawing on the fearsome reputation of the actual Carbonari. Founded in 1809 in Capua as a form of resistance to Bonapartism, this largely middle-class secret society claimed an institutional ancestry dating back to mutual-aid societies of charcoal burners in medieval Germany. Their radical nineteenth-century reputation was based, however, on their involvement in European revolutionary movements of the 1820s and 1830s. With lodges in France, Spain, Italy, Greece and Russia, the Carbonari became a potent political force at this time, lending their support to the constitutional insurrections in Spain and Naples in 1820 and 1821, the independence movement in Greece in 1821, and the Decembrist rising against Tsar Nicholas II in Russia in 1825. Along with many other clandestine organizations, the Carbonari also participated in the European revolutions of 1830 and, to a lesser extent, those of 1848 as well. In the Italian states, membership probably exceeded two hundred thousand men, and, according to Italian historians Shepard Clough and Salvatore Saladino, "between 1820 and 1831, the Carbonari and kindred conspiratorial organizations held the main stage in Italy's struggle for political freedom" (28). Mazzini actually joined the society in 1827, but left four years later disappointed with their lack of results. Later in 1831 he founded Young Italy, which eventually absorbed what was left of the Italian Carbonari, thereby cementing its ties in many people's minds with the figure of the secret society.

However, despite this factual basis for connecting Italian unity with the figure of the secret society, these English invocations of the Carbonari did not generate even the level of uneasy agreement over the Italian Question that past invocations of Thuggism and Jesuitism had over trade unionism and English Catholicism. There certainly were those who used the factual and figurative presence of Italian secret societies to "to show how little the Italians are fitted for free institutions, and how greatly corrupt governments are the natural product of decaying nationalities" ("Italy: Her Nationality or Dependence," 350), but their opinions were countered by numerous others. Some of these more sympathetic individuals made sure to dissociate Italian unity from radical politics. As one author for the *Westminster Review* wrote,

> It is a most pleasing circumstance to see the interest taken by England in the struggles of Italy against temporal and spiritual oppression . . . for, in our opinion, this struggle is . . . one of the most important as regards the civilization and progress

> of the world. It is the war of the future against the past. It only fights for existence, for liberty, for the right of speech and action. She promulgates no wild theories, the constitutional banner is held aloft by a chivalrous monarch, heir to the oldest reigning house in Europe, surrounded by counselors belonging to the highest aristocracy, whose private wealth and station warrant them against all suspicion of entertaining ultra-democratic opinions. ("The Organization of Italy," 219)

Others expressed their support for Italian unity by absolving Garibaldi of his past connections to the Young Italy movement while including him among the ranks of such modern military heroes as Havelock and Clive.[11] Still others supplied money, munitions and even themselves to Garibaldi's volunteer regiments. It is in this outpouring of support for Garibaldi that one can most clearly see the ideological relativism at work in England's response to the Italian Question. By absolving or ignoring the secretive and borderline unlawful facets of Garibaldi's campaign for a united Italy, English writers (not to mention English volunteer fighters) actively placed themselves in an ideologically conflicted position. Not only were they advocating a revolutionary cause strikingly similar to the brutally repressed revolt in India and the fight for nationalism in Ireland, thereby going against England's imperial policy of colonial guardianship, they were also supporting the use of secretive practices that they claimed to denounce. This inconsistency was rationalized using a doctrine of progress, constitutional monarchy and the natural rights of a European race, reinforced by invocations of the figure of the secret society, but the fact remained uncomfortably clear that England could not claim ideological high ground for its involvement in Italian affairs.

First published in *All the Year Round* between November 1859 and August 1860, the period of Garibaldi's activity in Sardinia and the island of Sicily, Wilkie Collins's *The Woman in White* deftly propels its readers through the ideological gauntlet of the Italian Question. Collins's novel is best remembered as the progenitor of the sensation fiction craze of the 1860s and 1870s, and his incorporation of elements of the 1856 Rugeley murder and the story of the Marquise de Drouhault from Maurice Méjan's *Recueil des causes célèbres* in his own narrative certainly justifies this sensational status.[12] However, the sensationalism of *The Woman in White* extends beyond just poison and wrongful imprisonment to the self-conscious manipulation of readers' confusion over Italian affairs.[13] Collins quite deliberately invokes the subject of Italy and then methodologically duplicates the ideological relativism surrounding that subject by constructing his own novel around a framework of transitive equivalencies, whereby individual instances of doubling lead to a network of similarities among characters, the reader, and the historical subtext of Italian unification. By alternating between political and extra-political registers of value, Collins offers Walter

and Fosco, Walter and England, and Walter and the reader as credible doubles for one another; as the common element of pairings, Walter serves a transitive function that implies further doubling—i.e., Fosco and England, Fosco and the reader. When read in the context of the Italian Question these implied equivalencies and their connection to common practices of secrecy reinterrogate England's ideologically confused support for Italian unification.

Collins's original audience would have been prepared to read *The Woman in White* in light of the Italian Question for a number of reasons. Not only was Italy the hottest topic of public debate since the Indian Mutiny, it was also a prominent subject in the novel's original place of publication, *All the Year Round*. Beginning in June 1859, the journal ran a series of sympathetic articles on Italian affairs that roundly denounced Austria's occupation of northern Italy as the illiberal domination of a people clearly capable of governing themselves.[14] The articles directly related the Italians' fitness for self-government to their European racial ancestry, an ancestry they shared with the Irish, who nevertheless remained England's colonial subjects. Already in Collins's place of publication, then, one can recognize an incipient conflict between racial ideology and imperial ideology that Collins would evoke again with Walter's trip to the Central American jungle. Readers would also have been moved to think of Italy by Collins's careful choice of dates. Set in 1849–1851, *The Woman in White* takes place during the years following the European revolutions of 1848 and leading up to the Great Exhibition, years in which foreign immigration brought increased numbers of both Italian revolutionaries and Austrian spies to England.[15] The former were largely welcomed as the persecuted advocates of liberal sentiment, despite their past practices of secrecy, whereas the similarly secretive behavior of the latter made them anathema in respectable English society. These two groups are embodied in the novel by the diminutive Professor Pesca, who "had left Italy for political reasons (the nature of which he uniformly declined to mention to any one)" (35), and who now teaches Italian to the English, and by Count Fosco, whose curiosity about "Italian gentlemen" living in England, official foreign correspondence and Vienna address quickly identify him as an agent of the Austrian government (245).

Within this self-consciously allusive Italian context, Collins constructs a narrative whose form works against itself to faithfully dramatize the confusion of ideologies this context would have invoked for his readers. The novel begins with a brief Preamble that explains how a pseudo-legal method of multiple narrators will be used to tell the story.[16] Although written by what appears to be a standard Victorian omniscient narrator, the Preamble is actually the work of the novel's hero, Walter Hartright, who admits parenthetically that he is "the writer of these introductory lines" (33), but then downplays his own central role in both the story and its compilation, referring to himself in the third person as only one of a succession of narrators. He also

neglects to mention his own financial and social interest in the narrative's apparent objectivity, obscuring his own rise from drawing master to father of the future Lord of Limmeridge House behind the impersonal declaration that "This is the story of what a Woman's patience can endure, and what a Man's resolution can achieve" (33).[17] As a narrator, Walter uses this strategy of legal self-effacement in order to set up an implied binary opposition between the forces of law, order and moral uprightness, represented by himself, and the opposing forces of lawlessness, disorder and immoral activities, represented primarily by Count Fosco and secondarily by Percival Glyde. This strategy allows Walter to assume the moral and political authority of an idealized legal system even as he denounces the actual Court of Justice as "the pre-arranged servant of the long purse" (33).

However, the majority of the novel works against Walter's monological intentions by breaking down the facile binary of the Preamble through the use of doubling. More specifically, Walter and Fosco/Glyde are brought together by their similar practices of secrecy. As a narrator, Walter departs from the rubric of presenting "the story always in its most direct and most intelligible aspect" and allowing the relevant narrators to "relate their own experience, word for word" numerous times (33): he changes the names of all the participants, informing the reader of this alteration only once, immediately after the inquest at Sir Percival's death, and justifying his concealment out of concern for Laura (563); he also abstracts, and one can presume alters, the accounts of Marian and Laura (435), Mrs. Clements (479) and Professor Pesca (594). His conduct is strikingly similar that of Fosco and Glyde, both of whom also take egregious liberties with the documents of others—opening and altering Marion's letters, reading and appending her diary, and altering the parish register. In other words, all three characters strive to reveal one part of the truth while concealing others and secreting this very process of concealment.

The characters are also brought together by their synonymous practices of active deception. Walter's deceit is confined to the novel's third Epoch, in which he conceals himself, Marian and Laura in the East End of London, devising for each of them "an assumed name" and a place in an "assumed relationship" (433). Taking the two floors above a small newsvendor's shop, he masquerades as Marion and Laura's brother, ironically deploying the illusion of familial ties in much the same way as Sir Percival, who also lives under what the law would consider an assumed name as a result of the assumed marital relationship between his parents. Walter's assumed identity also mirrors that of Count Fosco, who, as a former member of the Brotherhood—an Italian secret society—now working for the Austrian government as a spy on Italian revolutionaries in England, must also shed his real name and be prepared to flee England at the first potential sign of recognition from his former associates (598). Walter also doubles Fosco during his "secret inquiries and investi-

gations" into the conspiracy to defraud Laura of her identity (453), self-consciously manipulating Mrs. Vesey (457), Mrs. Clements (479), and Mr. Wansborough (528)—much as Fosco does—in an attempt to discover "the Secret" behind Sir Percival's behavior. Knowing that the revelation of this investigation would delay him at the inquest, and perhaps call into question his own actions during the vestry fire,[18] Walter also keeps this information to himself not only during the inquiry into the circumstances of Sir Percival's death (543), but also during the final revelation of the conspiracy to the tenants at Limmeridge House (638).

In thus representing Walter and Fosco as doubles for one another, the novel complicates the initial question of moral authority raised by the Preamble's invocation of an ideal Court of Justice. Walter retains his role as hero, to be sure, since even though his methods may be questionable, his motive of saving Marion and Laura remains recognizably "good," not to mention appropriately "manly." Likewise, as the primary threat to Marion and Laura, Fosco never ceases to play the villain; however, his evident similarities to Walter, combined with his own force of character, make his villainy intensely attractive.[19] Marian herself is not immune to Fosco's charismatic effect, referring to him as "that illustrious foreigner" (225), and admitting to "a strange, half-willing, half-unwilling liking for the Count" (246) after the space of only a few days. Once she knows him better, her response is even more intense: "His eyes seemed to reach my inmost soul through the thickening obscurity of the twilight. His voice trembled along every nerve in my body, and turned me hot and cold alternatively" (310). Marian's uneasy attraction to the Count stems in part from her recognition that "He looks like a man who could tame anything" (239). However, she also admits to some of his many other endearing qualities, including his resemblance to Napoleon I, his command of the English language, his fondness for his pet animals, and his capacity to talk, "when anything happens to rouse him, with a daring independence of thought, a knowledge of books in every language, and an experience of society in half the capitals of Europe, which would make him the prominent personage of any assembly in the civilized world" (243).[20] Even Walter is forced to admire "the horrible freshness and cheerfulness and vitality of the man" (587), as well as his artistic behavior at the opera (589–90), and his "extraordinary mixture of prompt decision, far-sighted cunning, and mountebank bravado" and "prodigious strength of his character, even in its most trivial aspect" when confronted on the night of his departure (611, 613).

The secretive/deceptive practices that bring Walter and Fosco together also begin to hint that the ideal of familial order on which the remaining moral force of Walter's narrative is based may be coming apart. Walter's claim to justice rests on his protection of Marion and Laura, and he frequently invokes Laura as the justification for his secretive behavior. When he sets up house with the sisters, for example, he does

so in order to protect the mentally shattered Laura from readmission to the asylum; likewise, when he twice declines to reveal his reasons for being at the scene of Sir Percival's death, he justifying his reticence using Laura. The first of these actions introduces dishonesty into the domestic sphere, thus inaugurating an implicit connection between domesticity and duplicity that is further strengthened by his "innocent deception" concerning Laura's worthless sketches, which he pretends to sell in order to make her feel productive and bind her more closely to the "assumed" domestic relationship that he and Marian have created (499–500).[21] In other words, he claims to tell his story so that Laura can regain her true name and true relationship to him and to her family, but in so doing he reveals the extent to which family names and relationships can be aligned with practices of deception. His second more public act of concealment introduces yet another complication for the ideal of domesticity underlying Walter's narrative by placing the family and the domestic sphere in direct conflict with the rule of law.

Once one recognizes that the novel also represents Walter as a double for imperial England, these domestic complications take on a more political character that resonates with the contemporary conundrum of Italian unification. It is significant that Walter's aptitude for secrecy does not appear until he returns to England from an expedition to Central America. Several critics have noted the pivotal role of this journey and have offered compelling explanations for how a trip to the New World jungle helps to "make a man" of Walter.[22] In thus connecting secrecy, manliness and imperialism, however, the novel raises a number of troubling questions about England's relationship to its colonies: 1) why is English manliness only to be found among and learned from the "subject races"; 2) why does that manliness depend upon secretive practices; and 3) how can the English continue to justify their colonial presence if, rather than imparting the benefits of civilization they are instead taking morally questionable behaviors back to England in order to outfox other residents of the urban jungle?[23] *The Woman in White* does not attempt to answer these questions, but by asking them it does raise new problems with England's overseas "civilizing" missions.

In a perceptive study of the "agents of empire" at work in Collins's text, Lillian Nayder provides a historically sensitive argument connecting the novel's subtle questioning of imperial ideology with England's response to the Italian Question. According to Nayder, Walter's transformation from a "gentlemanlike young man" (151) to a "gentleman" (540) capable of being mistaken for Sir Percival Glyde (534) is the result of his attempt to develop the Central American jungle into a civilized place: "Stressing the 'primeval' condition of the natives encountered by the Englishman, Collins justifies Hartright's presence in Central America; defining his hero against this racial other, he empowers him. Collins transforms the English servant into a gentleman by means of his contact with the savages" (1). However, if these

very savages have something to teach Walter about how to be a man, then their supposedly "natural" inferiority to the English begins to look somewhat arbitrary, much as the Italians' inferiority to Austrians was seen to be by the authors of the four aforementioned articles in *All the Year Round*.

For Nayder, the lack of "ideological purity" in Walter's civilizing mission is further undermined by its similarity to Count Fosco's reverse colonization of England. She interprets this similarity as a challenge to the project of imperialism, whether practiced among the Central American savages by England or among the comparatively civilized Italians by Austria. However, in the context of England's ideologically conflicted response to the Italian Question, one can take her argument even further: Collins's novel not only challenges Austria's right to occupy northern Italy, it also contravenes English attempts to wholeheartedly oppose that occupation, since not only is England doing the same thing overseas (and in Ireland), but England's criteria for judging between savages and civilized persons rests in part on an ethos of manliness already compromised by its own secretiveness.

Such problematic reflections on the Italian Question are only exacerbated by the novel's commitment to subtly implicating the reader as yet another double of Walter. Their relationship grows especially close in the Third Epoch, when Walter determines to expose Sir Percival's "Secret." His avowed reluctance to do so until his other options have been exhausted allows him to appeal to his readers' distaste towards secretive practices, even as he forces them to accept the necessity of his obsession with secrets.[24] Once he begins his investigation, Walter carefully secures the reader as his trusted accomplice, seeming to rely on readers' judgment, for example, through his growing fondness for interrogative narrative. For instance, after his interview with Mrs. Catherick, Walter asks himself and the reader a series of questions:

> Was it possible that appearances in this case had pointed one way while the truth lay all the while unsuspected in another direction? Could Mrs. Catherick's assertion, that she was the victim of a dreadful mistake, by any possibility be true? Or, assuming it to be false, could the conclusion which associated Sir Percival with her guilt have been founded in some inconceivable error? Had Sir Percival, by any chance, courted the suspicion that was wrong for the sake of diverting from himself some other suspicion that was right? (492)[25]

Walter also elicits readerly participation in the story by affectively describing his own emotions so as to reproduce them in sympathetic readers; from his admitted red herring that Sir Percival might be Anne's father to his final discovery of the duplicate register (488–530), Walter makes the reader a sensational partner to his heart palpitations (488, 529), base despair (523), and giddy elation (529). However, it is

in a brief moment of remembered tenderness that Walter employs his most direct strategy of naming the reader his friend (500).

He repeats all of these techniques during his final contest with the Count. Once again, he asserts that he has little choice in the matter, having been forced by Glyde's untimely death to confront his co-conspirator (570). He also draws readers into the story by questioning them at key moments, such as when he receives Marian's telegram urging him to return to London (562), when he finally discovers Anne's patrilinear relationship to Laura (574), and when he decides to allow the Count to depart from England (611). In addition, while on Fosco's trail he continues to meticulously record his own emotional reactions: breathless anxiety (562), confusion (591), and fevered impatience (603). As if to establish the purity of his motives, Walter also takes two brief emotional detours into marital bliss (581–82, 602), tacitly reminding readers of the friendly intimacy that he shares with them.

This intimacy allows Walter to subtly initiate readers into the aesthetic pleasures of secrecy. The motivation to read on that Walter's repeated questioning and affective emotionalism fosters ultimately relies on the revelation of secrets: readers are teased by "the secret" of Sir Percival's illegitimacy, and this initial secret prepares them to uncover the darker secrets of Pesca and Fosco's membership in the Brotherhood. Walter reveals this organization just enough to titillate readers with what they do not know and then refuses to divulge any more (595–98), making them into the group's willing but ignorant accomplices. In this way, the novel maneuvers readers into the same position as English supporters of Italian unification and exposes them to the same ideological conflicts brought on by the figurative presence of Italian secret societies. Such a narrative strategy coerces readers into proving the insufficiency of middle-class England's politico-juridical attitude towards secretive practices. Reflecting back on his unlikely victory over the Glyde-Fosco conspiracy, Walter notes that he never could have succeeded had he remained within the confines of English law (640).

This reflection, together with the novel's network of transitive equivalencies, gives credence to Fosco's assertions concerning morality and criminality, which appear in their most doctrinal form in the 17 June entry of Marian's diary. While allowing his tame mice to crawl over his body in a manner that suggests to Marian "hideous ideas of men dying in prison with the crawling creatures of the dungeon preying on them undisturbed" (253), Fosco engages her and Laura in a conversation that ranges widely over criminality, morality and the interrelation of the two. According to the Count, crime and its detection represents a

> trial of skill between the police on one side, and the individual on the other. When the criminal is a brutal, ignorant fool, the police in nine cases out of ten win. When the criminal is a resolute, educated, highly-intelligent man, the police in nine cases

> out of ten lose. If the police win, you generally hear all about it. If the police lose, you generally hear nothing. And on this tottering foundation you build up your comfortable moral maxim that Crime causes its own detection! Yes—all the crime that you know of. And what of the rest? (256)

The conversation quickly turns from the moral relativism revealed by England's approach to crime to the ideological relativism evident not only in differences between various nations' definition of virtue, but also in the moral inconsistency practiced in England, a topic with resonant undertones of the contemporary Italian Question. "Mr John Bull," says Fosco, sanctions all kinds of ideologically conflicting behavior at home, including the confinement of "Mr Honesty" in a workhouse as reward for his frugality, the relief of "Mr Scoundrel" as a reward for his criminal confinement in prison, and the sale of respectable women in marriage as a reward for their femininity (256–57). Such domestic inconsistencies make English attempts to pronounce judgment on foreign affairs open to critique. The fact that Walter's secretive behavior actually exemplifies Fosco's theories of moral and ideological relativism in action only adds force to Fosco's later dismissal of Walter's, and by extension England's, assertion of moral authority as mere "moral clap-traps" (609).

Even in death Fosco continues to unsettle English notions of law and morality while invoking the figure of the secret society and the Italian Question. Proving his own theory of crime, the Count actually escapes England without so much as a whisper of police pursuit. Instead, he is caught and murdered in France by the vengeful machinations of the Brotherhood. Walter invites the reader to see this as an instance of Providential justice at work, but one cannot help noticing that this act of Providence was set in motion, as Fosco recognizes, by Walter's "treachery" (608) to the Brotherhood's own vow of secrecy. Furthermore, Fosco's death is a clear allusion to the unsuccessful assassination attempt on Napoleon III by Orsini in 1858. Fosco is frequently compared to Napoleon I, whom Louis Napoleon tried desperately to emulate, making the Count an effective surrogate for Napoleon III. At the same time, the fearful reputation of the Brotherhood makes it an ideal stand-in for the Carbonari, which was linked through Orsini to the attempt on the life of Napoleon III. This unsuccessful attempt produced months of legislation and periodical condemnation in England, but its fictional success is presented as perfectly acceptable and even morally appropriate. This leaves readers in a double bind: either they agree with Walter and applaud the Count's death, thereby tacitly endorsing the "wild justice" of secret societies; or they condemn Walter's murderous treachery, thus accepting the Count's doctrine of crime. Either way, the novel forces readers to identify with someone whose practices of secrecy call into question the very ideal "Court of Justice" constructed by middle-class England's political mores.

II. Italian Union and Disraeli's *Lothair*

The years immediately following the publication of *The Woman in White* put to rest any remaining fears in England that Italy would unite as a radical republic. However, this is not to imply either that Italy lost its allure among the reading public or that the figure of the secret society disappeared from discussions of the Italian Question. Indeed, public interest in Italian affairs remained strong even after the Italian Parliament declared Victor Emmanuel II King of the constitutional monarchy of Italy on 14 March 1861. At the same time, brigandage in southern Italy, the continued presence of radical republicans, and Rome's aggressive stance against unification and for papal infallibility—with charges of Jesuitism resulting in both cases—ensured that the figure of the secret society would retain its rhetorical prominence. Garibaldi also helped to secure continued English interest in Italian unification by participating in the 1866 conflict with Austria that saw Italy gain control of Venetia and leading attacks by semi-secret volunteer armies on Papal forces in the Romagna in 1862 and 1867. The second of these attacks nearly succeeded before it was driven back by French troops on 3 November at Mentana.[26] Napoleon III kept the Pope in control of Rome for three more years, then, in September 1870, pulled out all of his troops, thereby allowing Italian forces to take possession of the city on 2 October 1870. Public elections overwhelmingly supported this turn of events, with 89 of every 90 votes being cast in favor of annexation and the subsequent unification of the Italian peninsula.

Most of the elements of England's early rhetorical confusion surrounding Italian unification remained in use during these later events as well. Garibaldi continued to inspire English Protestants to support the Italian cause, especially once he renounced his connection to Mazzini by surrendering southern Italy to Victor Emmanuel II. His repeated attacks on Papal forces in Rome using volunteer troops only added to the fervor of hero-worship that surrounded his name in England.[27] At the same time that Garibaldi's star continued to ascend, Louis Napoleon's fell precipitously, with numerous periodical writers voicing their continued distrust of his involvement in Italian affairs: W. C. Cartwright, in an article for *The Fortnightly Review,* summed up public sentiment when he observed, "The sympathies so freely professed in the abstract by English politicians for Italy struggling to constitute herself as a State have been interwoven with more or less mistrust in the process that has been pursued towards that end, and in the probable action upon the infant State of that auxiliary influence [France] which served as the means of helping Italy into existence" (Cartwright, "The Policy of Italy," 641).[28]

Napoleon III was particularly suspect because of his support for the Pope in the 1860s. During this time, anti-Popery was on the rise again in England in response to a number of Anglo and Roman Catholic initiatives, including the growing influence of ritualism in High Church circles, the publication in 1864 of Pius IX's *Syllabus of Errors,* which denounced liberal ideas about God, and the ultra-montane movement, which sought, and ultimately succeeded in procuring in 1870, a declaration of Papal infallibility.[29] These anti-Catholic sentiments frequently influenced the ways in which English Protestants responded to the Italian Question, prompting many of them to support unification largely because it would diminish the temporal authority of the Papacy.

However, the subject of Popery inevitably led back to one of the main problems with supporting unification: England's own imperial relationship with Ireland. This relationship could be connected to the Italian Question in one of two ways: either, England's relations with Ireland were analogous to those of Piedmont with Naples—a liberalizing role of progressive leadership—and therefore the unification of Italy ought to be supported because it was similar to the unification of Great Britain; or, the calls for independence made by republicans in Ireland were analogous to those made by Italian partisans in Lombardy, Venetia and Rome, in which case supporting Italian unification might expose the imperial hypocrisy of England's continued possession of Ireland.[30] The question of Ireland grew only more vexing to English readers as the decade progressed, with the nadir of Anglo-Irish relations occurring in 1867, when members of the Irish Republican Brotherhood staged an unsuccessful revolution and killed a dozen Londoners in an unrelated prison break attempt at Clerkenwell prison. Irish Roman Catholics also secretly enlisted both money and men to support the Pope's occupation of Rome, a direct violation of the Foreign Enlistment Act, and an indirect challenge to the soon-to-be disestablished Irish Church.[31] This increasing militancy by Irish nationalists further complicated the Italian Question by making it impossible to forget that any response to Italian unification would have imperial repercussions at home.

In some ways, secret Irish revolutionary activity only strengthened the rhetorical connection between Ireland and Italy, which continued to be represented in England as a land literally honeycombed by secret societies. Even though his influence was waning, Mazzini remained an important object of criticism for English writers deeply suspicious of his republican doctrines.[32] In fact one rare Mazzini supporter, C. E. Maurice, complained that "Hackneyed traditions, wildly improbable stories, have gathered round his name, till every trace of the real man is lost in the conventional stage-conspirator" (54). The figure of the secret society also surfaced in discussions of Italian brigandage (1862–63), a southern Italian resistance movement spearheaded by those still loyal to the Bourbons but practiced by a wide range of peasants,

mendicants, criminals and others disaffected with Piedmont's recent acquisition of the Two Sicilies. One *Blackwood's* author characterized this resistance as "Terrorism," a sentiment whose "wide diffusion . . . throughout the nation" allowed Italy's numerous "secret societies" to take "root in the land" ("Italian Brigandage," 576).[33] The continued presence of these societies made supporting the Italian Question an ideologically risky proposition. The English remained firmly opposed to secret societies in general and to revolutionary secret societies in particular, especially given the activities of such organizations in Ireland. However, by approving of events in Italy, English writers found themselves tacitly taking sides with these very societies, thereby aligning their political opinions with practices of secrecy they otherwise denounced.

On 2 May 1870, only months before the Italian Question would be answered by the *fait accompli* of Italy united and the furor over ultra-montanism would reach its peak with Rome's declaration of infallibility, Longman's issued the first edition of Benjamin Disraeli's highly topical *Lothair.* Like Collins, Disraeli incorporates the conflict of ideologies surrounding the Italian Question into his novel, which is set between August 1866 and August 1868, the period of Garibaldi's final assault on Rome. Also like Collins, Disraeli simultaneously presents domesticity—here a figure for England's official policy of noninterference—as a way to escape the contradictions of the public sphere and reveals the extent to which the domestic realm is implicated in these same contradictions. However, unlike *The Woman in White, Lothair* explicitly foregrounds these issues and their relationship to Italian unification: the climactic scenes of the novel occur in Italy during the failed attack on Mentana, and Lothair, the story's impressionable title character, actually equips and fights with Garibaldi's forces.

Lothair also features an unprecedented array of factual and fictional secret societies, including, but not limited to, the Carbonari, the Jesuits, the Fenians, the Atheists, the Illuminati, the Freemasons, the Mary Anne societies, and even something called the Standing Committee of the Holy Alliance of Peoples. Including these organizations allows Disraeli to interrogate the productive functions of the figure of the secret society more thoroughly in *Lothair* than he or anyone else had in any of the other texts already discussed in this book. As a result of this attention, the figure of the secret society assumes a central role in the novel, binding together Italian unification, Irish nationalism and Roman Catholicism into a sticky web of conflicting ideologies. In order to move among these strands, Lothair is forced to abandon ideological purity and exercise the same ideological relativism that was historically required of English respondents to the Italian Question. Eventually, he tries to retreat from such relativism by abandoning the public sphere altogether and getting married; however, Disraeli does not let him off so easily. Domesticity turns out to be yet another strand in the web formed by the figure of the secret society. In thus com-

pletely enmeshing Lothair in the conflict of ideologies brought on by the Italian Question, Disraeli offers a trenchant critique of English refusals to acknowledge that, even in the semi-sacred realm of private life, any claims of ideological purity—and therefore of natural superiority over the Austrians, the Irish, or even the ultra-montane Roman Catholics—are dangerously compromised by England's pervasive rhetoric of secrecy and tacit reliance on the figure of the secret society.

In addition to its meticulous attention to the figure of the secret society as it relates to the Italian Question, Disraeli's *Lothair* has another quality that sets it apart from the other novels discussed earlier: it is largely unread today except by dedicated literary biographers. Such a lack of critical regard dates back to the novel's first reviews, most of which ranged from emphatically negative to openly hostile. *The Quarterly Review,* for instance, described it as "lively and amusing," but "a failure," "unnatural" and "a vast maze of verbiage" ("Mr Disraeli's *Lothair,*" 83–84),[34] while the review in *Macmillan's* vituperatively concluded, "A single conscientious perusal (without skipping) of 'Lothair,' would be a credible feat: few will voluntarily attempt a second" ("Lothair," 159).[35]

There is no record of the number of times individual readers attempted a "conscientious perusal" of *Lothair,* but it is important to note that, despite its poor reviews, the novel was an international bestseller. In Britain, the original edition of 2000 copies disappeared from store shelves almost immediately, and by 6 May Thomas Longman could write to Disraeli that he would have to print a sixth thousand just to keep pace with demand. Before the novel was ten days old, nearly 7000 copies had been sold in England alone, and arrangements were already underway for a cheap Australian edition. In the United States the novel sold even faster. Mssrs Appleton's initial printing of 25,000 sold out in three days; by the end of October over 80,000 copies of *Lothair* had been purchased by American readers. In the absence of critical attention, such overwhelming popular support is significant because it suggests that Disraeli's fictional study of the figure of the secret society and the Italian Question had the opportunity to influence the public's response to current events. In other words, even though it is now among the many forgotten texts of the Victorian period, during this time of ideological crisis it enjoyed a prominent place in the public consciousness.[36]

For the benefit of modern readers unfamiliar with *Lothair,* I will provide a brief summary of the novel to help ground my analysis of its connection to the Italian Question and to the figure of the secret society.[37] The novel's title character is an immensely wealthy orphan, based loosely on the third Marquess of Bute,[38] who is about to come of age and take full control of his property. Lothair's wealth had heretofore been held in trust by his two guardians, a Scotch Presbyterian uncle, Lord Cullodan, with whom Lothair had dwelt in relative isolation prior to the beginning of the story, and

a Catholic convert, Cardinal Grandison, whom he had never met.[39] Lothair's incipient riches and ducal title make him the object of three competing conspiratorial groups: the Anglicans, the Roman Catholics, and the radical republicans. Each group is represented in the text by a woman—Lady Corisande (Anglicans), Clare Arundel (Catholics), and Theodora Campion (Radicals)—and each woman attempts to woo Lothair into her camp.[40] After unsuccessfully proposing marriage to Lady Corisande and nearly joining the Roman Catholic Church at the behest of Clare Arundel, Lothair ultimately follows "the divine Theodora" to Italy, where he pledges himself and his wealth to Garibaldi's 1867 invasion of the Romagna. At the fictionalized battle of Mentana, Theodora is killed and Lothair is seriously wounded by France's last-minute entry into the fray. He convalesces under the care of Clare Arundel in Rome, where he becomes the dupe of a plot to make it appear as if he has converted to Catholicism. Narrowly escaping from pursuing Monsignori, he finds asylum with an acquaintance of Theodora whom he had met in England, one Mr. Phoebus, a dandy and an aesthete who combines doctrines of Aryan superiority with artistic bohemianism. Phoebus drops Lothair in Syria, where he meets the ecumenical Paraclete, who supplements the racial doctrines of Phoebus with some of his own and reassures Lothair that there are multiple true religions. Lothair then returns to England, dispels the rumors of his conversion, marries Lady Corisande, and becomes a respectable Anglican duke.

As this summary indicates, Lothair faces the same three options as English respondents to the Italian Question. He can choose to support Italian unification by following Theodora to Italy, or he can elect to oppose Italian unification by joining Clare Arundel among the Roman Catholic faithful, or he can adopt a neutral position by marrying Lady Corisande and retreating into private life. Unfortunately for Lothair, none of these options remains free from ideological conflict. The additional factors of Irish nationalism, widespread practices of Jesuitism and a domestic sphere rife with secrecy and political intrigue make any choice at best a compromise among necessary evils and at worst a specimen of ideological relativism.

Irish nationalism is mentioned in several places during the course of the text, each time appearing as a dangerous political possibility connected to the same kind of revolutionary goals motivating Italian unification. One of Cardinal Grandison's agents, Monsignore Catesby, introduces the Irish quite early in the novel. While being debriefed by his ecclesiastical superior, Catesby connects militant unrest in Ireland to the American Civil War—another conflict that sorely tested England's neutrality—and to a possible loss of power for the papacy:

> Now that the civil war in America is over, the Irish soldiery are resolved to employ their experience and their weapons in their own land; but they have no thought for

> the interest of the Holy See, or the welfare of the Holy religion. Their secret organization is tampering with the people and tampering with the priests. The difficulty of Ireland is that the priests and the people will consider everything in a purely Irish point of view. To gain some local object, they will encourage the principles of the most lawless liberalism, which naturally lands them in Fenianism and Atheism. (48–49)

Lothair actually meets some of those tending towards "lawless liberalism" when he stumbles into a Fenian meeting in London. Disguised under a plea for subscriptions to a Roman Catholic chapel and school, these members of "the vast and extending organization of the brotherhood" mistake Lothair for a spy and threaten to kill him before he is rescued by a mysterious stranger bearing a paper whose mark cows even the Fenian leader (112–15). Lothair's rescuer turns out to be a former comrade-in-arms with Garibaldi and a leading figure in a fictional secret society called the Standing Committee of the Holy Alliance of Peoples. This group of "extreme Republicans" is also involved in a plot to liberate Ireland, and has gotten so far as to arrange for American assistance as Catesby had feared.[41]

The Standing Committee problematizes unqualified support for Italian unification in two ways. First, the group provides a direct link between Irish nationalism and Italian affairs, since in addition to contemplating aid for the Fenians, they also strive towards the liberation of Italy and the overthrow of Papal power in Rome. This link between Ireland and Italy makes any alliance with Theodora ideologically compromised for someone who, like Lothair, wishes to keep Great Britain united. Second, the Standing Committee also serves as a reminder that Italian unification remains bound up with Italian secrecy, and that in working for the former sympathetic Englishmen implicitly support the latter. This implication is made more obvious by the iconic status of Theodora, who is herself the living embodiment of "Mary-Anne," another fictional secret society based in France and Italy and dedicated to Italian unity. This cause is also supported by the super-secret Madre Natura, another creation of Disraeli, who describes it in the following terms at the beginning of Chapter LIV:

> The Madre Natura is the oldest, the most powerful, and the most occult of the secret societies of Italy. Its mythic origin reaches the era of paganism, and it is not impossible that it may have been founded by some of the despoiled professors of the ancient faith. As time advanced, the brotherhood assumed many outward forms, according to the spirit of the age: sometimes they were freemasons, sometimes they were soldiers, sometimes artists, sometimes men of letters. But whether their external representation were a lodge, a commandery, a studio, or an academy, their inward purpose was ever the same; and that was to cherish the memory, and, if possible, to secure the restoration, of the Roman republic, and to

> expel from the Aryan settlement of Romulus the creeds and sovereignty of what they styled the Semitic invasion. (263)

These rather abstruse goals help to illuminate the ideological bind such secret societies produced for English men and women committed to Italian unification. On the one hand, Madre Natura is rendered attractive to an English audience by its protean connections with Freemasonry, its opposition to the "Semitic invasion" of Roman Catholicism and its non-democratic aspirations to empire. On the other hand, the group remains suspect because of its secrecy, its lack of Christian affiliations and its potential for generating revolutionary unrest. Yet, as Lothair discovers, one cannot strive for Italian unification without granting to secret societies like the Standing Committee of the Holy Alliance of Peoples, Mary Anne, and Madre Natura a degree of acceptance by virtue of their involvement in the same struggle.

This formidable trio of secret societies is opposed in the novel by the equally imposing organization of the Roman Catholic Church, which also works to prevent Italian unification. Cardinal Grandison, Monsignore Catesby, Clare Arundel and numerous others all work tirelessly to thwart Italian nationalists' designs on Rome. This is, in fact, the reason that Catesby has returned to England in the first place:

> The Monsignore had made another visit to Paris on his intended return to Rome, but in consequence of some secret intelligence which he had acquired in the French capital had thought fit to return to England to consult with the Cardinal. There seemed to be no doubt that the revolutionary party in Italy, assured by the withdrawal of the French troops from Rome, were again stirring. There seemed also little doubt that London was the centre of preparation, though the project and the projectors were involved in much mystery. "They want money," said the Monsignore; "that we know, and that is now our best chance. The Aspromonte expedition drained their private resources; and as for further aid, that is out of the question; the galantuomo is bankrupt." (73)

On the one hand, this opposition by the novel's Roman Catholic characters to the activity of "the revolutionary party" made in the name of a sovereign, the Pope, who had ruled over the territory in question, Rome, for approximately fifteen hundred years agrees with English policies of anti-radicalism and support for traditional monarchs. On the other hand, the prodigious and secret efforts of such dedicated individuals make the Catholic Church in *Lothair* appear to be entirely composed of the most Jesuitical Jesuits ever to hatch a Popish plot. Unfortunately, Lothair cannot have one hand without the other, and so he is forced to choose between the equally compromised options of working for or against the Church in Rome.

By the time one has followed Lothair on his topical grand tour through Italian independence movements and Roman Catholic conversion attempts, one is almost persuaded by the novel's assertion that all of European politics boils down to "the Church against the secret societies. They are the only two strong things in Europe, and will survive kings, emperors, or parliaments" (250). However, this simple and extreme division of European affairs leaves Lothair little room for matrimonial neutrality. In fact, the domestic sphere in *Lothair* is not isolated at all from the novel's explicitly political topics. Mrs. Putney Giles, the wife of Lothair's solicitor, with her facility for bringing together "a medley" of "priests and philosophers, legitimists and carbonari" (43), is certainly the most visible sign that English domesticity does not stand apart from revolutionary politics. With her "principle mission . . . to destroy the Papacy and to secure Italian unity" (35), she is even explicitly connected with both Mazzini and Garibaldi: "It was rumored that the brooding brow of Mazzini had been observed in her rooms, and there was no sort of question that she had thrown herself in ecstatic idolatry at the feet of the hero of Caprera" (35).

However, Mrs. Putney Giles is not alone: Lady Corisande and the text's other staunch Anglicans also employ their domestic connections to match the Jesuitical Grandison plot-for-plot in their attempt to win over Lothair. If the Catholics circulate a "deftly drawn-up announcement which had been deeply planned" implying Lothair's incipient adoption of the Catholic faith at a mass held at the parish's Anglican cathedral, whose Bishop must preach at Muriel chapel and would therefore be "not present to guard it from the fiery dragon" (209), then the Anglicans are not above joining forces with the Italian revolutionaries to frustrate their designs:

> "You mistake," said Theodora quietly, when Lady Corisande had finished. "I am much interested in what you tell me. I should deplore our friend falling under the influence of the Romish priesthood."
>
> "And yet there is danger of it," said Lady Corisande, "more than danger," she added in a low but earnest voice. "You do not know what a conspiracy is going on, and has been going for months to effect this end. I tremble." (215)

A similar doubling of Catholic and Anglican plotting occurs later in the novel when, after weeks of convalescent surveillance, Lothair agrees to support Clare Arundel at an unspecified, but suspicious, celebration at the Jesuit church of St. George of Cappadocia. His agreement elicits the following reaction from two of the novel's Popish plotters:

> In the evening reception, Monsignore Catesby approached Father Coleman. "It is done," he said, with a look of saintly triumph. "It is done at last. He will not only

> be present, but he will support her. There are yet eight-and-forty hours to elapse. Can anything happen to defeat us? It would seem not; yet when so much is at stake, one is fearful. He must never be out of our sight; not a human being must approach him."
>
> "I think we can manage that," said Father Coleman. (312)

Catesby and Coleman are meant to appear reprehensible in their desire to isolate Lothair from the outside world, and yet their plans merely replicate the strategy already practiced by Lothair's Scottish guardian while he was a child, studiously segregating the boy from Grandison and from most signs of society. After this mass with Clare Arundel, Lothair despairs upon reading a newspaper article both declaring that he supported the Pope's forces during Garibaldi's failed assault on Rome and imputing that his participation in the celebration at the Jesuit church of St. George signals his firm allegiance to the Roman Catholic Church. He recognizes for the first time the extent to which his enforced conversion has been striven for by his Catholic acquaintances: "That seemed only a petty plot in London, and he had since sometimes smiled when he remembered how it had been baffled. Shallow apprehension! The petty plot was only part of a great and unceasing conspiracy, and the obscure and inferior agencies which he had been rash enough to deride had consummated their commanded purpose in the eyes of all Europe, and with the aid of the great powers of the world" (321). He escapes again through the combined efforts of Anglican friends in Rome and Italian revolutionaries and sails away to Palestine with Mr. Phoebus, who subjects Lothair to his own attempt at an enforced conversion on the way. As the irate reviewer for *Macmillan's* noted, it is often difficult to see significant differences among the novel's many conspirators. This similitude suggests that, although supposedly neutral, England is deeply involved in the "mighty struggle between the Church and the secret societies" (258), and that this involvement makes it an uneasy double for both sides.

Disraeli thus places the novel's English Protestants in an ideologically conflicted position. On the matter of secretive practices, *Lothair*'s Anglican faithful duplicate those performed by Grandison, Catesby and the entire Roman Catholic contingent in order to oppose them on matters of religion. This opposition allies them with the Continental secret societies, who also work against the Pope, but do so primarily on the basis of the political principles of nationalism and radical republicanism. These principles lead the Standing Committee of the Holy Alliance of Peoples, for example, to also strive for the independence of Ireland, a goal that places them in conflict with England and the Papacy, who are thus brought together on a politico-religious issue of significance to the sovereignty of both parties. As individual representatives of English policy, therefore, Lothair's Protestant friends find them-

selves simultaneously allied with, in opposition to, and practical doubles of both the Church and the secret societies.

Even as he explores the ideological conflicts inherent in Lothair's three choices by, among other things, exposing their common reliance on the figure of the secret society, Disraeli also subjects that figure to penetrating analysis. As evidenced above, the relationship between the Church and the secret societies is repeatedly represented in the text as a "mighty struggle," even a "death struggle" (258), and one of the most important weapons for both sides is the figure of the secret society. The principle secret societies in the text—the Standing Committee of the Holy Alliance of Peoples, Mary-Anne, and Madre Natura—deploy this figure positively to convince themselves and others of their influence and potential for action. Large bodies of unseen followers provide reference points for enlisting the aid of others in their supposedly already well-supported enterprise: The Standing Committee, for example, uses this strategy to try to enlist the aid of Lothair's rescuer, the General, in an Irish rebellion (56), and this same technique surfaces again during a meeting between the General and Colonel Mirandola regarding Italian unification (158). During the original meeting between The Standing Committee and the General, past risings (Polish, Greek, Romanian, German—all unsuccessful) are also invoked as a source of solidarity for the group of multinational revolutionaries (57).[42] This same meeting also provides an example of a third positive use to which the figure of the secret society is put, the invocation of a specific society in order to generate revolutionary consensus:

> "[W]e always drink one toast, General, before we separate. It is to one whom you love, and whom you have served well. Fill glasses, brethren, and now 'To MARY-ANNE.'"
>
> If they had been inspired by the grape nothing could be more animated and even excited than all their countenances suddenly became. The cheer might have been heard in the coffee-room, as they expressed, in the phrases of many languages, the never-failing and never-flagging enthusiasm invoked by the toast to their mistress. (57–58)

Over the course of the text, Mary-Anne is joined in this role by Garibaldi (159, 255), and, after Garibaldi's arrest, by Madre Natura (262–64, 272–73). In each case, the particular figure serves as a talisman against the overwhelming odds facing the revolutionaries, and as a fetish around which these disciples of liberty can join together.

The results of these positive strategies are mixed, at best. Among those who are already members of the secret societies, they work admirably, as the unified toast to Mary-Anne demonstrates. They also may succeed in recruiting a small number

of impressionable followers like Lothair to the revolutionary cause, and even in precipitating the 1867 attack on Rome. However, as the General recognizes in relation to the possibilities of an Irish rebellion, at least, these strategies may hide a lack of readiness among the revolutionaries; after rescuing Lothair from the Fenian meeting, the General tells him, "'I have just returned from Ireland, where I thought I would go and see what they really are after. No business is in them. Their treason is a fairy tale, and their sedition a child talking in its sleep'" (115).

More problematic, though, is that these positive and relatively public invocations of the figure of the secret society often succeed in generating as much or more fear among opponents as unity within the revolution. The activities of the Mary-Anne societies prompts anxious preparations in the Church (248–49), whereas the revolutionary rhetoric of Garibaldi persuades France to consider returning to Italy: as the General tells Lothair, "'All our danger is from France. The Italian troops will never cross the frontier to attack us, rest assured of that. . . . And it is most difficult, almost impossible, for the French to return. There would never have been an idea of such a step, if there had been a little more discretion at Florence, less of those manifestoes and speeches from balconies'" (255). Ultimately, France does return, joining with the Papacy to crush the 1867 attack on Rome by the forces of Garibaldi and the secret societies.

At the same time that the revolutionaries are generating consensus among themselves and inadvertently among their enemies by positively deploying the figure of the secret society, the Church is fostering unity of a different sort through its own negative invocation of the same trope. Put simply, the Church simultaneously lumps together and stigmatizes all of its opponents by labeling them Atheists. Thus, Catesby, Grandison and other Catholic clergy progressively label the Fenians as Atheists (48–49), the Italian revolutionaries as Atheists (73, 238), and the Freemasons and other secret societies as Atheists (401). This figure of "the Atheists" successfully robs individual groups of their own revolutionary message and unites the faithful against them. Lady St. Jerome, for example, responds to this figure first with fear—"'Where are we to look for aid,' exclaimed Lady St. Jerome, 'against the assassins and atheists?'" (48–49)—and later with ardent faith: "'It is the Atheists alone, I fear, who are now carrying everything before them, and against whom there is no rampart, except the rock of St. Peter'" (65). Even Lothair is convinced at first, ironically confiding to Theodora, the living emblem of the Mary-Anne societies, "'There is no doubt the Atheists are bolder, are more completely organized, both as to intellectual and even physical force, than ever was known. I have that from the highest authority'" (153).

The figure of Atheism also allows the Church to justify its own (often unpopular) practices. Grandison, for example, explains that Papal troops are needed in Rome not to subdue the populace, but to control the many Atheists who have infiltrated the city:

> "I really believe," said the Cardinal, "that a more religious, a more happy and contented people than the Roman never existed. They could all be kept in order with the police of one of your counties. True it is the Holy Father is obliged to garrison the city with twelve thousand men of all arms, but not against the Romans, not against his own subjects. It is the Secret Societies of Atheism who have established their lodges in this city, entirely consisting of foreigners, that render these lamentable precautions necessary. They will not rest until they have extirpated the religious principle from the soul of man, and until they have reduced him to the condition of wild beasts. But they will fail, as they did the other day, as Sennecherib failed. These men may conquer Zouaves and Cuirassiers, but they cannot fight against Saint Michael and all the Angels. They may do mischief, they may aggravate and prolong the misery of man, but they are doomed to entire and eternal failure." (309)

The Cardinal characterizes infallibility, too, as an essential step against the forces of Atheism, "'a demonstration of power on the part of the Holy Father, which no conqueror from Sesostris to Napoleon has ever equalled'" (401). Given the defeat of the revolutionary attack on Rome and the almost-certain passage of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility by the end of *Lothair,* it seems clear that the Church's strategy of negatively deploying the figure of the secret society is highly effective.

III. Conclusions

Disraeli's novel undoubtedly offers the nineteenth century's most detailed fictional analysis of the figure of the secret society and its relationship to representative politics. As such, it represents the apogee of the rhetoric of conspiracy with which I have concerned myself throughout this book. In fact, the rhetoric of Atheism deployed so effectively by the Roman Catholic Church in *Lothair* matches very closely the ways in which the figure of the secret society was opportunistically invoked by English propagandists during the trial of the Glasgow spinners, the debate over Catholic emancipation, the Tractarian controversy, the uproar over "Papal aggression" and the Indian Mutiny—all events Disraeli had observed from his unique vantage as a Member of Parliament and former Prime Minister. Faced with a politically radical challenge to its own patriarchal authority, the Church wages a war of words that rhetorically disarms its opponents of their revolutionary potential by using their own secretive practices against them. From nationalists, they are transformed into Atheists, just as the spinners had been made into Thugs, the Catholics Jesuits, and the Indians mutinous conspirators.

In his own reductive portrayal of Irish nationalism, Disraeli even offers an apparently less self-conscious continuation of the kind of conflict of ideologies brought to light in these previous moments of democratic stress by the invocation of the figure of the secret society. Presented primarily as a foil for Italian unification, Irish nationalism is carefully excluded from the reader's sympathy in a number of ways. First, Fenian conspirators nearly attack the novel's title character after they discover him listening to them preach sedition. Second, the General, who is presented throughout the text as a selfless hero willing to sacrifice his own life for the righteous cause of Italian union, judges them childish. Third, even the Church disdains to have anything to do with them, branding them parochial Atheists who cannot think beyond the local concerns of their island. This narrative attempt to dismiss Irish nationalism obscures the fact that Irish nationalists were acting on the same principle of securing self-government for an oppressed people as their Italian counterparts. Similar to the ways in which denunciations of the Glasgow spinners as Thugs or the Tractarians as Jesuits ring hollow in the face of congruities between trade unions and Parliament, or between reserve and gentlemanly self-fashioning, so the dismissive representation of Irish nationalists as Fenians in Disraeli's text is undermined by their essential identity with the more positively valenced conspiratorial groups. The only way that the Fenians substantially differ from the other secret societies in *Lothair* is that they are Irish, suggesting that the novel's disapprobation may, itself, be an example of political propaganda.

In addition to showing in unparalleled detail the ways in which invocations of the figure of the secret society had been deployed up to 1870 to misrepresent collective political action as the work of a conspiracy, *Lothair* also provides evidence that the significance of such invocations was beginning to change. In part, this change was due to the fact that the sheer flexibility of the figure had begun to interfere with its political utility. By 1870 accusations of conspiracy had been made so many times and in so many different contexts that they had lost their rhetorical edge; if conspiracy was so widespread, then it hardly seemed so damning to be labeled a conspirator. In addition, the growing internationalism of England's rhetoric of conspiracy since mid-century had begun to weaken the connection between the figure of the secret society and the predominantly domestic issue of political representation.[43] The very profusion of Continental secret societies in *Lothair* that so irritated some of its early reviewers is, itself, a product and an indication of this rhetorical dilution.[44]

The overwhelmingly political connotations of the figure of the secret society were also beginning to be displaced by an increasingly prominent association between secrecy and domesticity.[45] Enabled by the growing importance of "home," as documented in John Tosh's "The making of masculinities" and "New Men?," this association had

begun to raise troubling questions about the supposedly separate "private sphere."[46] Lothair's inability to escape the signs of his past support for Italian unification, either by sailing away with the radical aesthete, Mr. Phoebus, or by spiritually solemnizing his relationship to Lady Corisande and the Anglican Church, makes perspicuous the crucial collapse of secrecy and privacy these questions implied. Furthermore, by depicting this collapse of categories in the context of marriage, Disraeli suggests that the distinction between the analogous categories of secret society/conspiracy and private family may be just as porous. In so doing, *Lothair* suggests that the key problematic of the larger Victorian rhetoric of secrecy of which it is a constituent element may no longer be only whether or not working-class, Roman Catholic, mutinous Indian and revolutionary Italian (and Irish) practices of secrecy uncomfortably resemble those of respectable middle and upper-class Englishmen, but whether such similarities implicate the supposedly separate sphere of domesticity itself as just another form of middle- and upper-class secrecy.

Afterword

In chapter 10 of Joseph Conrad's *The Secret Agent,* at the end of his final report to Sir Ethelred on the Greenwich Park Observatory bombing, the Assistant Commissioner offers the following summary of his findings: "'Yes, a genuine wife. And the victim was a genuine brother-in-law. From a certain point of view we are here in the presence of a domestic drama'" (222). In thus echoing Conrad's own hint in his Author's Note that the whole novel can be productively reduced to "the story of Winnie Verloc," wife of the titular Secret Agent Δ, the Assistant Commissioner also shows just how much the changes to England's rhetoric of conspiracy suggested in *Lothair* had progressed by the early twentieth century. Although *The Secret Agent* features a catalog of conspirators rivaling that in *Lothair*—socialists, anarchists, terrorists, Continental spies, agents-provacateurs, and undercover police—Conrad's novel eschews Disraeli's concern for politics and uses these many conspirators as mere points of entry in the marriage of Adolf and Winnie Verloc. Further subordinating all possible connotations of secrecy to the domestic realm, Conrad's narrator describes this marriage as "kept up on the wages of a secret industry eked out by the sale of more or less secret wares: the poor expedients devised by a mediocre mankind for preserving an imperfect society from the dangers of moral and physical corruption, both secret, too, of their kind" (258). The family, it seems, is the ultimate secret society.

By making a Russian plot designed to compel the British police to more aggressively monitor political dissidents into the final act of Verloc's "domestic drama," Conrad displays the full potential for parody latent in England's rhetoric of conspiracy. The Assistant Commissioner's choice of the word "drama" transforms the novel's web of conspiracy into a pleasurable spectacle, one designed to tantalize the viewer even as it satirizes the ease with which political opportunists can invoke the figure of the secret society to accuse someone of conspiracy. Such opportunists, the novel suggests in one of its most vivid images, are like the hapless Stevie, who draws "circles, circles, circles; innumerable circles, concentric, eccentric; a coruscating whirl of curves, uniformity of form, and confusions of intersecting lines suggesting a rendering of cosmic chaos, the symbolism of a mad art attempting the inconceivable"

(45). In this rendition of England's fungible rhetoric of conspiracy, there is no beginning or endpoint, only a constant interconnected revolution that, like Carlyle's rhetorical revolution in *Sartor Resartus,* circles an empty center.

As Conrad's novel suggests, however, the irony of responding to all accusations of conspiracy with parody is that such a response may, itself, ensure that some conspiracies remain a secret. Verloc, "the far-famed Secret Agent Δ of the late Baron Stott-Wartenheim's alarmist despatches" (180), does know many actual secrets. Moreover, as Chief Inspector Heat reflects, the revelation of these secrets could have far-reaching consequences: "The turn this affair was taking meant the disclosure of many things—the laying waste of fields of knowledge, which, cultivated by a capable man, had a distinct value for the individual and for the society. It was sorry, sorry meddling. It would leave Michaelis unscathed; it would drag to light the Professor's home industry; disorganize the whole system of supervision, make no end of a row in the papers . . ." (210–11). And yet, Heat tells Verloc, "'You won't be believed as much as you fancy you will'" (210). The accuracy of this observation is confirmed by Sir Ethelred himself, who, in the interview alluded to earlier, and despite the information to which his Cabinet position undoubtedly makes him privy, stops the Assistant Commissioner at one point to remark, "'All this seems very fantastic'" (219). The potential for parody—a potential writ large in what Peter Knight has termed our contemporary "conspiracy culture," with its "presumption toward conspiracy as both a mode of explanation and a mode of political operation" (3)—makes a straightforward account of a conspiracy seem unbelievable, even unreal. This aura of unreality remains an enduring, if unwitting, legacy of the Victorians' myriad plots of opportunity. Originally deployed to construct immediate belief for the purposes of propaganda, they have helped to foster a more long-term fascination with secrets and a profound skepticism of the possibility of revelation.

Notes

Notes to Introduction

1. This standard of manliness is perhaps epitomized by Charles Kingley's doctrine of muscular Christianity, which receives extensive scrutiny in James Eli Adams's *Dandies and Desert Saints;* see 98–102, 106–47.

2. Such a concentration on the secret society as a rhetorical figure at once aligns my project with J. M. Roberts's emphasis on the "mythology" of secret societies and distances it from more fact-based studies. One work that operates between these two extremes is Sissela Bok's *Secrets,* which investigates the ethics of secrecy, including that of secret societies. See her fourth chapter, "Secret Societies," 45–58, for a helpful discussion of some of the ethical implications of secret societies in a variety of social conditions.

3. My approach is modeled after that of Mary Poovey in *Uneven Developments,* which draws on a wide range of texts and approaches in order to "extrapolate" and "reconstruct" a "symbolic economy" of middle-class femininity that delimits the "conditions of possibility for those texts" (15).

4. Saltmarsh's comment is expanded upon by J. M. Roberts on 9–11 of *Mythology.*

5. *British Poets and Secret Societies* contains a number of essays that attempt to make connections between various secret societies and such writers as Percy Shelley, W. B. Yeats, and Rudyard Kipling. It also offers background material on Freemasonry, the Rosicrucians, and the Golden Dawn, as well as on more well-known historical phenomena like the Combination Acts, the Luddite rebellion and the Tolpuddle Martyrs. *Secret Texts: The Literature of Secret Societies* is a collection of critical essays on topics ranging from Yeats's affiliation to the Golden Dawn to Thomas Peacock's parody of the Illuminati in *Nightmare Abbey* to Rudyard Kipling's *Kim* and colonial Freemasonry.

6. See especially chapter 6, "Moses in Egypt," 234–90.

7. See chapter 2 of *Dandies and Desert Saints,* "'A Sort of Masonry': Secrecy and 'Manliness' in Early Victorian Brotherhoods," 61–106.

8. The difficulty of defining what constitutes a secret society can be seen in both Norman MacKenzie's *Secret Societies* and Charles Heckethorn's *The Secret Societies of All Ages and Countries.* In his Introduction MacKenzie first proposes a gradation of associations—open, limited, private, secret—then warns against "trying to force particular associations into these categories, for we know that there are many intermediate degrees of secrecy" (14). Heckethorn similarly backs away

from his first attempt to classify secret societies into seven categories based on their ultimate goals—religious, military, judiciary, scientific, civil, political, and anti-social—admitting that "the line of division is not always strictly defined," and proposing instead the "two comprehensive divisions of religious and political" (I: 3), though it remains unclear what exactly these two terms represent or where one starts and another begins.

9. Kucich also offers a pithy "sketch of the cultural prominence of Victorian truth-telling" on 4–17 of *The Power of Lies.*

10. Kucich helpfully identifies several of these explanatory models on 14–33 of *The Power of Lies.*

11. Welsh, 13–15.

12. Welsh also briefly addresses the Post Office scandal on 54.

13. In addition to Kucich and Adams, both of whose projects are dedicated to documenting just this sort of individual resistance, see 80–84 of Philip Barker's *Michel Foucault* and 212–15, 254–56 of Mark Cousins's and Athar Hussein's *Michel Foucault* for more on this problem of resistance.

14. The strengths and the weaknesses of an exclusively Foucauldian approach are best seen in D. A. Miller's groundbreaking study, *The Novel and the Police.* Miller touches on secrecy and surveillance in the Victorian novel as a literary genre and his formalist approach provides an excellent model for identifying the attitudes toward the figure of the secret society engendered by the rhetorical devices of particular texts, as well as the ways in which narrative strategy can serve to mask an arbitrarily circumscribed field of meaning. However, Miller's exclusively Foucauldian approach sometimes itself arbitrarily circumscribes his texts' fields of meaning to the unambiguous reinforcement of the social panopticon, even though a text like Wilkie Collins's *The Moonstone* remains self-divided over its apparently monological resolution via the marriage of Franklin Blake and Rachel Verinder.

15. Dahl defines the seven criteria of polyarchy on 220–24 of *Democracy and Its Critics.*

16. Raymond Williams provides an extraordinarily helpful discussion of the history of the word "democracy" in England on 93–98 of *Keywords.*

17. Of necessity, this account of Victorian England's struggle to achieve more equitable political representation is both abridged and filtered through the lens of contemporary criticism. Even Victorian radicals might have felt uncomfortable identifying their goals as "democratic," preferring instead terms like "representative," "popular" or even "republican," whereas more conservative reformers probably would have described themselves as Whigs, Liberals, Utilitarians or even Tory Radicals rather than advocates of guardianshi Despite their choice of terms, however, the main issue separating the period's various pro-democracy positions was whether political representation should be direct or mediated, inherent or earned, a division most clearly captured by the more modern terms that it helped to spawn, radical and guardianship democracy.

18. A fuller summary of both positions is given on 123–30 of Jon Roper's *Democracy and Its Critics.*

19. Lively and Rees, 59. Lively and Rees reproduce all of the texts of this debate, including the revised 1824–25 edition of Mill's "Essay," Macaulay's response, and Bentham and Mill's responses to Macaulay. Their Introduction also provides a summary of the complexities of the debate (1–52), which centered not just on democracy but also on the usefulness of Utilitarian arguments for crafting public policy.

20. Ibid., 72–79. Mill's position is itself grounded not in Paine's *Rights of Man,* but in a number of works by Bentham, including *Plan of Parliamentary Reform, in the Form of a Catechism, with Reasons for Each Article: with an Introduction, Showing the Necessity of Radical, and the Inadequacy of Moderate Reform* (*Works,* III: 433–557) and "Resolutions on Parliamentary Reform" (*Works,* X: 495–97). Bentham's *Book of Fallacies* (*Works,* II: 371–488) also contains a number of relevant thoughts on the non-representative system of government current at the time.

21. Another important transitional figure in the democracy debates is Thomas Carlyle, whose "Signs of the Times" contains a penetrating criticism of democratic reform as merely another species of mechanism. As Raymond Williams observes in *Culture and Society,* "Carlyle sees democracy, in fact, as in one sense an expression of the . . . laissez-faire spirit: a cancelling of order and government, under which men can be left free to follow their own interests" (79–80). Carlyle was the most articulate advocate of an older non-democratic form of aristocratic guardianship. This important alternative to democracy and Carlyle's relation to it will be explored in detail in chapter 1.

22. See, e.g., 52–53 and 479–82.

23. See, e.g., 183, 239–49, and 409–10. Tocqueville explains that this "tyranny of the majority" is so dangerous because, "there is nothing so irresistible as a tyrannical power that commands in the name of the people, because, being vested with the moral power that belongs to the will of the greatest number, it acts at the same time with the decision, the promptness, and the tenacity that a single man would have" (212).

24. Mill would later incorporate many of the major points of Tocqueville's argument into *On Liberty* (1859).

25. Mill, "Tocqueville on Democracy in America, vol. II," *Essays on Politics and Culture,* 256–60. Himmelfarb suggests that this crucial reversal in the second review signals Mill's early break with the Utilitarian radicalism of his father and Jeremy Bentham brought on by his father's death, a break equally evident in Mill's "Civilization" and his companion essays on Bentham and Coleridge (xxi-xxiv).

26. Advocates of radical democracy were divided, however, between republicans, who largely followed Paine's example of reconceiving the state according to rationally-derived and self-consciously ahistorical ideals of "natural rights," and constitutionalists, who sought to justify democracy using English political traditions supposedly dating back to before the Norman invasion. In *Radical Expression,* James Epstein helpfully differentiates between these two forms of English radicalism and shows how they continued to inform one another through the mid-nineteenth century; see especially his first chapter, 3–28.

27. Macaulay's account of the making of the Constitution of 1688 is worth noting, not only

because the ceremonies he describes were still used on formal occasions, but also because they resemble the rituals of more esoteric secret societies: "As our Revolution was a vindication of ancient rights, so if was conducted with strict attention to ancient formalities. In almost every word and act may be discerned a profound reverence for the past. The Estates of the Realm deliberated in the old halls and according to the old rules. Powle was conducted to his chair between his mover and his seconder with the accustomed forms. The Serjeant with his mace brought up the messages of the Lords to the table of the Commons; and the three obeisances were duly made. The conference was held with all the antique ceremonial. On one side of the table, in the Painted Chamber, the managers for the Lords sate covered and robed in ermine and gold. The managers for the Commons stood bareheaded on the other side. . . . The assentors of liberty said not a word about the natural equality of men and the inalienable sovereignty of the people" (*History* III: 285).

28. As Jon Roper notes, "By describing the adaptive ability of the constitution to meet new challenges by overturning old precedents and claiming new conventions as part of ancient traditions, historians like Macaulay attempted to find in their nation's history a defence against the incursion of new ideas such as democracy, republicanism and an equal right to liberty. If the constitution was protean, it might endure without changing its outward forms: instead merely periodically admitting a different emphasis on the relationships which existed within it" (120).

29. As Elaine Hadley notes, "this royal melodrama seems specifically designed to obscure rather than reveal the secret transactions going on in private boxes" (173).

30. "A cabinet is elected by a legislature; and when that legislature is composed of fit persons, that mode of electing the executive is the very best" (Bagehot, 27).

31. Bagehot identifies in descending order of importance five functions for the House of Commons: 1) to choose the Prime Minister, "the most important function of the House of Commons" (165); 2) to express the mind of the English people; 3) to teach the lower orders in need of education; 4) to inform the English people of the important issues of the day and various minority opinions of those issues; and 5) to legislate. This hierarchy of functions places him squarely in the guardianship camp, even without his assertion that the Prime Minister and his cabinet will masterfully direct the House of Commons much as a good rider does his horse: "A good horse likes to feel the rider's bit; and a great deliberative assembly likes to feel that it is under worthy guidance. . . . A great assembly is as soon spoiled by over-indulgence as a little child. The whole life of English politics is the action and reaction between the Ministry and the Parliament" (165).

32. See also Mill's comments in *Thoughts* (*Essays,* 345). Mill's *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform* is reprinted on 327–58 of *Essays on Politics and Culture.*

33. See Mills comments in *Thoughts,* found on 346 of *Essays;* and *Considerations,* 182.

34. To these nineteenth-century critiques might be added a more modern post-structuralist one; namely, that Mill's fears stem from his inability to think outside of class-identity politics, to consider that a given manual laborer might have divided and even contradictory loyalties that could cause him to vote differently from other members of his class.

35. See also Mill's position in *Thoughts,* found on 341 of *Essays.*

36. *Considerations,* 139–41. Mill's plan was to award a number of votes to each individual that was roughly commensurate with their level of education and innate intelligence, as measured by a national exam that would have presumably been authored by and measured against Mill himself.

37. More recently, Chantal Mouffe and others have rewritten Tocqueville's question in declarative form: "capitalist relations constitute an insuperable obstacle to the realization of democracy" (Mouffe, 2).

38. The reason I have stressed actions rather than intentions is that some of those characterized as members of secret societies, like Roman Catholics, would not themselves have necessarily supported radical democracy. Instead, they wanted only the removal of their own legal disabilities. However, in pressing for equality for themselves they indirectly forwarded equality for all, both by establishing a precedent that others could follow and by appealing, in however limited a fashion, to the doctrine of social equality.

39. For more on the dangers of this tutelary power, see 663–65.

40. On the desirability of private associations, see 667–68. Earlier, Tocqueville also makes an observation especially relevant to this study when he observes that, despite the danger inherent in an unlimited freedom of association, such an unbridled right does have one singular advantage: "in countries where associations are free, secret societies are unknown. In America there are factious persons, but no conspirators" (184).

41. This shift towards representing Roman Catholicism as a foreign threat to all good Englishmen is, to a certain extent, a natural outgrowth of logic behind Catholic Emancipation itself, since, according to Gauri Viswanathan's *Outside the Fold,* Tory support for Emancipation "was motivated in part by the conviction that aiming for a nation of good Englishmen was a more realistic goal that achieving a nation of good Anglicans" (5). Viswanathan makes a powerful case that removing Catholics' legal disabilities was a way to deemphasize their religious identity in order to foster their secular identity as citizens of England.

42. Invocations of the figure of the secret society therefore negatively signify the same gap between bourgeois modernity's promises and its willingness to meet those promises as the publication of radical manifestoes do in the same period. According to Janet Lyon, "the manifesto is the form that exposes the broken promises of modernity: if modern democratic forms claim to honor the sovereignty of universal political subjecthood, the manifesto is a testament to the partiality of that claim" (3). See her analysis of the rhetorical and ideological characteristics of the manifesto form in chapter one, "Manifestoes and Public Spheres," esp. 32–34.

Notes to Chapter 1

1. See Pick and Knight, 105.

2. With the exception of the first two of these journals, reference to which is found in Pick

and Knight, 163, all of the above journals and their publication dates come from the *British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books* (1955).

3. This widespread rhetorical presence of English Freemasonry makes it akin to what Richard Altick, in *The Present of the Present,* refers to as a topicality of everyday life.

4. In *Daniel Deronda,* George Eliot has the German music master Klesmer welcome Gwendolyn on "the hard, climbing path of an endeavouring artist" by saying, "'If you take that more courageous resolve I will ask leave to shake hands with you on the strength of our freemasonry, where we are all vowed to the service of Art, and to help her by helping every fellow-servant" (241, ch. 23). Dickens also connects freemasonry and art in *Little Dorrit,* through Henry Gowan's ironically deflated "brotherhood of the brush" (562, book II, ch. 7), whereas in *David Copperfield* he evokes the profession of the law when he has David refer to the "Masonic understanding" between himself and the Surrogate (612, ch. 43). Similarly, in *Bleak House* he yokes together law and the figure of freemasonry through the character of Mr. Tulkinghorn, about whom Volumnia Dedlock declares, "he must be a Freemason . . . [she is] sure he is the head of a lodge, and wears short aprons, and is made a perfect Idol of, with candlesticks and trowels" (625–26, ch. 40). Finally, Thackeray deploys the figure of freemasonry in *Vanity Fair* to rhetorically insulate the great world against narrative intrusion: "We must be brief in descanting upon this part of her career. As I cannot describe the mysteries of freemasonry, although I have a shrewd idea that it is a humbug, so an uninitiated man cannot take upon himself to portray the great world accurately, and had best keep his opinions to himself, whatever they are" (642, ch. 51).

5. See chapter 2, 61–106, es 65–75 on the public reception of Stanley's *Life of Arnold.*

6. This and the following section on Masonic history have been constructed from a variety of sources, including Norman MacKenzie's *Secret Societies,* 152–77; Charles William Heckethorn's *The Secret Societies of All Ages and Countries,* vol. II, 1–110; J. M. Roberts's *The Mythology of the Secret Societies,* 17–57; and Pick and Knight's *Pocket History of Freemasonry.* Specific references will be documented in the notes, but more general comments are an amalgam of the above four texts.

7. For a list of these divisions, see the entry on "Officers and Titles" in A. E. Waite's *A New Encyclopedia of Freemasonry* (II: 205–08), originally published in the late 1910s.

8. This internal division had been caused partly by a general slackness in the administration of the Grand Lodge up to 1751, when the split occurred, and partly by a number of changes in custom and ritual. For more details on the split, see Pick and Knight, 88–89.

9. Among Carlyle's twentieth-century critics, only Chris Vanden Bossche has attempted to connect Carlyle and Freemasonry. See his "The Speech of God-Devils" and his comments on "Cagliostro" and *Sartor Resartus* in *Carlyle and the Search for Authority.*

10. On the reception history of *Sartor Resartus,* see D. J. Trela and Roger L. Tarr's *The Critical Response to Thomas Carlyle's Major Works* and Jules Paul Seigel's *Thomas Carlyle: The Critical Heritage.*

11. I am aware of the irony involved in suggesting that *Sartor Resartus* could be right at home in a Tory periodical, since its original readers in *Fraser's Magazine* adamantly hated it, with many actually canceling their subscriptions. What I want to argue is not that Carlyle's text actually was

at home in *Fraser's,* but rather that elements of it were as violently Tory as the most hostile of its early readers.

12. This passage also has the added benefit of having already been subjected to intense critical scrutiny. See, for example, Charles Biernard's "Rebelling from the Right Siade" and G. B. Tennyson's *"Sartor" Called "Resartus."* The latter was the first and is still the most comprehensive account of the relationship between style and content in *Sartor Resartus* and of the relationship between this text and Carlyle's earlier work.

13. The radical political leveling implied by this example also hints at the book's second-to-last chapter, "Tailors," which not only elevates the figure of the tailor because it is he who makes these "clothes," but also suggests that everyone might be a tailor, or a maker of meaning. This radical possibility is also noted in Dibble, 33. However, the rhetoric of the "Tailors" chapter is more confused than Dibble acknowledges, since immediately after it suggests that all men might be tailors, it quickly specifies that society's tailors are most likely to be found among the nobility, poets, moral Teachers, and prophets of the world (III.11.212–13).

14. On Carlyle's heavy debt to German sources in *Sartor Resartus,* see John Clubb, "John Carlyle in Germany and the Genesis of *Sartor Resartus*"; Jerry Dibble, *The Pythia's Drunken Song;* Janice Haney, "'Shadow Hunting'"; Winnifred Janssen, "The Science of Things in General"; and William Witte, "Carlyle's Conversion." An unusual and, I think, unconvincing dissent to this general agreement about Carlyle's relation to German thought is voiced by Gerry Brookes in *The Rhetorical Form of Sartor Resartus.* Lee Baker, in "The Old Clothesman Transformed: Thomas Carlyle's Radical Vision," also argues for Carlyle's radicalism in *Sartor Resartus,* using the sympathetic portrait of the Jewish street merchant in Book III to argue that Carlyle mounts a radical critique of British anti-Semitism.

15. Other names offer similar hidden humor: Teufelsdröckh's publisher is *Stillschweigen und Co*^{mic}, "Silence and Company," which is located in *Weissnichtwo,* or "Know-not-where." Also, the paragraph is prefaced by the English Editor's ironically amused question, "what vacant, high-sailing air-ships are these, and whither will they sail with us?" (I.11.55). In addition, the emblems passage operates on the premise that human beings are naturally naked—"he [man] is by nature a *Naked Animal;* and only in certain circumstances, by purpose and device, masks himself in Clothes" (I.1.4)—not only in terms of meaning, but also in terms of clothes (else why would Clothes be so "inexplicably significant") and this abrupt, though subtle, juxtaposition of the ideas of nakedness, Emblems and kingship creates an effect not unlike that of the fable, "The Emperor's New Clothes," which laughingly makes the same Radical point that we are all nakedly equal under our clothes. Underscoring the importance of reading the humor in this passage is the English Editor's earlier assertion that the "man who cannot laugh is not only fit for treasons, stratagems and spoils; but his whole life is already a treason and a stratagem" (I.4.26). Echoing G. B. Tennyson, recent critics have begun to acknowledge the central importance of humor to Carlyle's rhetoric, with Abigail Burnham Bloom arguing that in *Sartor,* "Carlyle developed a process of transcending seemingly incongruous statements through a technique he called the 'inverse sublime'" (153).

16. A number of critics have argued that this formal difficulty does ultimately empower the reader. Brian Cowlishaw, for example, observes, "textual obscurity is in a sense required to relate Teufelsdröckh's Clothes-Philosophy appropriately. . . . If all means of expressing the Infinite, of embodying the ideal, are necessarily flawed and finite, then perfect, direct expression of ideas must be impossible" (51). Since Cowlishaw reads *Sartor Resartus* along radically Radical lines, he follows this more neutral observation with the assertion that Carlyle's style is designed to create active readers primed for "the work of cultural revolution," or the public recognition of social life as construction and presentation. Cowlishaw's comparison of Carlyle's verbal techniques and filmmaker Bertold Brecht's cinematic ones makes Carlyle into far more of a post-structuralist than I hope to show he is; nevertheless, his point about the effects of Carlyle's style on the consciousness of the reader is well-taken. In "The Open Secret of *Sartor Resartus,*" Lee Baker similarly argues that Carlyle's "pervasive ironic play with the meaning of symbols 'guides' the reader, as Carlyle says, to a stage of enlightenment whereby he begins to see the Open Secret of the Clothes Philosophy" (222). Other critics to notice the close relation between content and form include Charles Biernard, "Rebelling from the Right Side"; Jerry Dibble; Stephen Franklin, "The Editor as Reconstructor"; J. Hillis Miller, "'Hieroglyphic Truth' in *Sartor Resartus*"; and G. B. Tennyson.

17. Tennyson's close reading of this passage on 244–47 forms the basis for my own.

18. The refusal of *Sartor Resartus* to quiescently conform to contemporary notions of genre and periodization adds to its formal aura of mystery. Is *Sartor* a novel, a philosophical essay, a biography, an autobiography, a Romantic text, a Victorian text, a Modernist text? Most critics who address this issue label *Sartor* a "transitional text," wisely evading the need to apply conventional genre and period categories. See, for example, Baker, "The Old Clothesman Transformed"; Biernard; Dale Davis, "Symbolizing the Supernatural in Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus*"; Haney; and George Levine, "'Sartor Resartus' and the Balance of Fiction." Just how unsatisfactory a more definite answer is can be seen in John Lindberg's "The Artistic Unity of *Sartor Resartus,*" which awkwardly tries to label Carlyle's text "a true novel."

19. The Editor continues this important early material, promising to defend "the Institutions of our Ancestors . . . at all hazards" over the course of the book (I.2.11). This paternalistic assurance encourages the British Reader not to rely too heavily on his own "metaphysical acumen," because the Editor's objective ambivalence to some of Teufelsdröckh's ideas guarantees that both Editor and Reader are "on the same side," as it were. However, whether or not they really are "on the same side" is open to considerable debate. See, for example, Baker, "The Open Secret of *Sartor Resartus*"; Leonard Deed, "Irrational Form in *Sartor Resartus*"; Daniel Deneau, "Relationship of Style and Device in *Sartor Resartus*"; Dibble, 50–56; and Alvin Ryan, "The Attitude Towards the Reader in Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus.*"

20. Many critics discuss Carlyle's doctrine of symbols. Among the most helpful sources are Jeffrey R. Di Leo, "The Clothing of Truth"; Findley, 174–80; Gallagher, 195–99; and Hillis Miller, 8–19.

21. Though not published until 1833–34 in *Fraser's Magazine, Sartor Resartus* had already been completed by July of 1831, sixteen years prior to the publication of De Quincey's "Secret Societies."

For more on the publication history of *Sartor Resartus,* see Brookes, 16–47; Tennyson, 126–56; and Vanden Bossche, *Carlyle and the Search for Authority,* 40–42.

22. Earlier in the text, Teufelsdröckh had provided a potential example of virtuous secrecy in action when he speculated about the efficacy of hoodwinking an otherwise mutinous army: "'Suppose your sinews of war quite broken; I mean your military chest insolvent, forage all but exhausted; and that the whole army is about to mutiny, disband, and cut your and each other's throat,—then were it not well could you, as if by miracle, pay them in any sort of fairy-money, feed them on coagulated water, or mere imagination of meat; whereby, till the real supply came up, they might be kept together, and quiet? Such perhaps was the aim of Nature, who does nothing without aim, in furnishing her favourite, Man, with his so omni-potent or rather omni-patient Talent of being Gulled'" (II.3.86). In other words, normal men's capacity to be gulled, or to have concealment/secrecy successfully practiced upon them, is a gift from Nature to those extraordinary few who lead, or guard, everyone else.

23. This stress on the role of the hero is what motivates Carlyle to privilege biography over other forms of writing, since it is only in biographical works that "the Lives of heroic god-inspired men" are made manifest. For more on Carlyle and biography, including his own early biographical essays on Schiller, Goethe and others, see Patrick Brantlinger, "'Romance,' 'Biography,' and the Making of *Sartor Resartus*"; Deen; Sam Pickering, "*Sartor Resartus,* Thomas Carlyle, and the Novel"; Tennyson; and Vanden Bossche, *Carlyle and the Search for Authority.*

Notes to Chapter 2

1. Two pages later, *The Annual Register* rather gleefully observes that "the misdirected struggles of the 'working classes,' as they delight to call themselves, have been productive of results the very opposite to those proposed as their aim. And some of the most valuable and ingenious machines, in use, actually owe their existence to the pressure of trades-unions upon the capitalist, who naturally seeks, through the intervention of mechanical labour, to emancipate himself from the thralldom we have been describing" (206).

2. For more on Luddism, see John Dinwiddy's "Luddism and Politics in the Northern Counties," M. I. Thomis's *The Luddites: Machine-Breaking in Regency England,* Henry Pelling's *A History of British Trade Unionism,* 19–20, or E. P. Thompson, 547–602; on the Pentridge rising, see Thompson, 659–69; on the "Last Labourers' Revolt," see Thompson, 225–28; on the Captain Swing riots, see E. J. Hobsbawm's *Captain Swing.*

3. See chapters three (70–99) and five (147–65) of *Radical Expression,* which examine the parodic complex of meanings surrounding the cap of liberty and radical convivial dining, respectively, in England during the Napoleonic wars.

4. The Acts sought to do this primarily by combining these two distinct strands of popular discontent. As E. P. Thompson observes, "The Combination Acts (1799–1800) served only to bring

illegal Jacobin and trade union strands closer together," both in fact and in the popular imagination (181). For more on working-class societies at the turn of the century see Thompson, 102–85, 500–501, Baernreither, 115–430, or Pelling, 11–34. For more on the Combination Laws, see Pelling, 15–17, 20–23.

5. Baernreither even describes the repeal of the Combination Laws as "the turning point in the history of the English working class" (11). Engels's comments on this point are worth quoting in full because, despite their revolutionary stance, they display a distrust of secrecy very similar to that voiced by the critics of trade unionism: "At this point came help in the shape of a law enacted by the old, unreformed, oligarchic-Tory parliament, a law which never could have passed the House of Commons later, when the Reform Bill had legally sanctioned the distinction between bourgeoisie and proletariat, and made the bourgeoisie the ruling class. This was enacted in 1824, and repealed all laws by which coalitions between working-men for labour purposes had hitherto been forbidden. The working-men obtained a right previously restricted to the aristocracy and bourgeoisie, the right of free association. Secret coalitions had, it is true, previously existed, but could never achieve great results. In Glasgow, as Symonds relates [in "Arts and Artisans"], a general strike of weavers had taken place in 1812, which was brought about by a secret association. It was repeated in 1822, and on this occasion vitriol was thrown in the faces of the two working-men who would not join the association, and were therefore regarded by the members as traitors to their class. . . . So, too, in 1818, the association of Scottish miners was powerful enough to carry on a general strike. These associations required their members to take an oath of fidelity and secrecy, had regular lists, treasurers, book-keepers, and local branches. But the secrecy with which everything was conducted crippled their growth. When, on the other hand, the working-men received in 1824 the right of free association, these combinations were very soon spread over all England and attained great power" (214–15).

6. The recent prosecution, or perhaps persecution, of the Tolpuddle Martyrs in 1834 would have also reminded the public of the propensity of supposedly illegal oaths among the working classes.

7. All quotations from the trial come from Archibald Swinton's *Report,* the appropriate page numbers of which will be parenthetically noted in the text. A somewhat biased and much abridged summary of the trial is given in the Chronicle section of *The Annual Register* for 1838, 7–12.

8. For more on the legal conventions of this period in England and Scotland, see Leon Radzinowicz, *A History of English Criminal Law and Its Administration from 1750.*

9. This tendency toward grounding most of the charges under the rubric of a central conspiracy is even more pronounced in the aborted trial of these men in November, 1837. In this original trial, the spinners were charged with only nine crimes—charges three, four and five of the later trial did not yet exist—but all of them relied on the presence of the "secret select committee" or a similar conspiratorial body for validity. Given the results of the second trial, it seems fairly certain that had this first trial been allowed to continue, the men would have been acquitted on all charges. For a transcript of the first trial, see *The Rights of Labour Defended.*

10. In addressing the charge of murder against M'Lean, for example, the Lord Justice-Clerk

tells the jury that if they believe the defense's witnesses then M'Lean has an alibi, and then reminds them, "You know the account he [M'Lean] endeavours to give of this. You know the circumstance of his denying his name to the officer that apprehended him,—the state in which he was when the officer took him into custody. You know that he left Glasgow in a clandestine manner," etc. (368). This kind of qualified portrayal of the defense's evidence can be found throughout the Lord Justice-Clerk's statement.

11. Initially, the jury also found charge ten proven, but this decision was reversed by the court because of its dependence on the charge of conspiracy, which had been found not proven.

12. The opening follows its final biblical exhortation with examples of how "their betters" are acting to "monopolize a good thing," citing the Corn Laws, dueling, and the suppression of Canada as upper-class parallels of trade-union intimidation.

13. Note especially the first clause, "in the opinion of the jury," which follows the example of Lord Mackenzie and the Lord Justice-Clerk in implicitly discounting the jury's verdict.

14. The obvious implication, later voiced by O'Connell in the House of Commons, that trade unions and Parliament might enjoy a number of suggestive similarities, goes unstated.

15. The original petition was withdrawn due to members' objections, but a revised version was re-presented on 13 February. Echoing the writer in *Tait's Edinburgh Review,* Mr. Wakley observed that "the public mind was most firmly disposed to entertain a feeling of prejudice against the unfortunate cotton-spinners of Glasgow. . . . From the very moment of the assassination of the unfortunate man, Smith, in Glasgow, the press and the authorities of the place had striven to cast a prejudice on the cotton-spinners, and to point them out as the persons by whom the murder was committed" (*Hansard,* 40: 1060).

16. O'Connell goes on to describe the Orange Association as an illegal combination that seemed exempt from government prosecution, despite the practice of dangerous oath-taking (*Hansard,* 40: 1069–72). As one might expect, none of this made it into the *Annual Register*'s account of the debate, which simply states, "Mr. O'Connell moved, by way of amendment, for a select committee to inquire into trades' unions and combinations generally, in the united kingdom" (207).

17. For the place of this metaphor of disease among Carlyle's rhetorical strategies for representing the Chartists, see John Plotz, "Crowd Power." According to Plotz, in *Chartism* Carlyle "wants to strip the crowd of language while retaining a sense of the importance of the message it has to convey" (97), thereby co-opting the Chartists' power to speak about themselves on the basis of what he represents as their "inarticulate" desire for a redress that only he can provide.

18. See also Brantlinger, *The Spirit of Reform,* 93.

19. For general background on the Thuggee see Heckethorn, *The Secret Societies of All Ages and Countries,* Vol. I, 245–51; and MacKenzie, *Secret Societies,* 64–83. The latter contains numerous contemporary illustrations and photographs.

20. For more on the differences between Burkas and Kuboolas, see "The Thugs; or, Secret Murderers of India," 358–59.

21. For more on the symbolism and rituals of the Thuggee, see 5–6 in the same source; "The

Thugs; or Secret Murderers of India," 375; and the sections on the Thuggee in Heckethorn and MacKenzie.

22. Careful readers might even have noticed the similarities between the review articles and Swinton's *Report of the Trial,* including the almost identical complaining in both of the difficulty of prosecuting trade unionists/Thugs. We have already seen the prosecutor's remarks to this effect regarding the spinners, but what is striking is the almost identical logic and language applied to the Thugs: "But even if all the English magistrates in India had been aware of and cordially co-operated with each other, they would have effected little towards the suppression of Thuggee. The ordinary tribunals and modes of proceeding, which answered in some degree for the detection of ordinary offenders, were of little use against Thugs. Except in the rare instance of a gang being apprehended with stolen property in possession, which the relations of the murdered person were there to identify, the only witnesses who could ever be brought against them were some of their own fraternity; and the evidence of men whose preliminary step must be to confess themselves the most ruthless villains in existence, is naturally received with great mistrust" ("The Thugs, or Phansigars," 12). The response to this difficulty in India was the appointment of an Inquisition-like body to pursue suspected Thugs ("The Thugs, or Phansigars," 15); some readers, no doubt, could see the efficacy of a similar step in England to prosecute suspected trade unionists.

23. See Brantlinger, "The Case," 37.

24. Ibid., 38–40; and *The Spirit of Reform,* 92–93.

25. For more on Dickens and Scott, see Alison Case's "Against Scott"; Kim Michasiw's "*Barnaby Rudge:* The Since of the Fathers"; and S. J. Newman's "*Barnaby Rudge:* Dickens and Scott." For connections between Dickens's novel and other literary works, see Iain Crawford's "'Nature . . . Drenched in Blood'"; Natalie Schroeder's "*Jack Sheppard* and *Barnaby Rudge*"; and Michael Stieg's "*Ten-Thousand-a-Year* and the Political Content of *Barnaby Rudge.*"

26. For more on the composition and publication history of *Barnaby Rudge,* see Butt and Tillotson's chapter on the novel in *Dickens at Work* and Thomas J. Rice's "The Politics of 'Barnaby Rudge'" in Robert Giddings, ed., *The Changing World of Charles Dickens.*

27. See Stieg, 68. Despite his observation on the important role assigned to Sim, Stieg uses him only as means to connect *Barnaby Rudge* to Samuel Warren's *Ten-Thousand-a-Year* (1839–41), concluding from his comparison of the two novels that Dickens's presentation of Sim reflects his "irrational class bias" (68). Certainly, this is an incomplete reading of the political ramifications of the novel, as I hope my analysis will show. However, Stieg's article is one of few to recognize Sim's importance in the novel. Sim also receives some small attention in Steven Marcus's *Dickens: From Pickwick to Domby* (185–86) and Myron Magnet's *Dickens and the Social Order* (61–62). One measure of the degree to which Sim has been forgotten is his absence from studies in which he would be highly relevant, including Kim Michasiw's "*Barnaby Rudge:* The Since of the Fathers," Thomas J. Rice's "The End of Dickens's Apprenticeship," and Joan Friedberg's "Alienation and Integration in *Barnaby Rudge.*"

28. Quotations from *Barnaby Rudge* will be cited parenthetically in the text according to chapter and page number.

29. T. A. Jackson goes a bit farther, calling Sim's inclusion "totally without historical warrant." His remarks are worth quoting in full, not only for their historical sensitivity to proto-trade unionism, but also because they offer a critique of Dickens's politics as reflected in his presentation of the 'Prentice Knights: "Not only is the whole notion of an apprentices' conspiracy in 1774 one as totally without historical warrant as it was made to appear ludicrous; it is open to serious objection on the ground that it burlesques most unforgivably the genuine 'conspiracies'—the earliest form of trade unionism—of the adult journeymen of the period. Dickens in short, cannot he acquitted of the charge of concocting a burlesque of the 'underground' Radical clubs of a period of struggle against anti-Jacobin reaction, and of the trade unions of the period before the repeal of the Combination Acts in 1825—a burlesque based upon caricatures circulated by malevolent Tories and reactionaries—and palming this off, by implication, as a picture of the operative machinery of Chartist agitation" (28).

30. A listing of all of Dickens's known and suspected historical sources for *Barnaby Rudge* can be found in Rice's Barnaby Rudge*: An Annotated Bibliography.*

31. There is a small minority of critics who contest this historical connection. S. J. Newman, for example, writes that the 'Prentice Knights "is surely no parody of 1830s Unionism" (178), though he gives no evidence for this claim.

32. See Rice's entry on *Chartism* in his *Annotated Bibliography.*

33. Dyson, for example, concludes that the "apprentices' designs against their masters' daughters are rendered doubly ridiculous, by the tawdry initiation ceremonies of their conspiracy, and by the moral as well as physical repulsiveness of the lads themselves" (57).

34. Note 3 to Chapter 8 of *Barnaby Rudge,* 749.

35. See esp. 215, 217.

36. See Rosenberg, 21.

37. The longest discussion of the 'Prentice Knights in print appears in Myron Magnet's *Dickens and the Social Order,* which identifies the group as a typical millenarian organization rather than placing them within the structure of social disorder presented in the novel (see 133–45).

38. Rice argues that this interconnection anticipates Dickens's similar tendency in his later, better-known novels. See "The End of Dickens's Apprenticeship," 172.

39. Harold Folland, in "The Doer and the Deed," arrives at a similar interpretation of the novel, and this interpretation leads him to suggestively identify John Chester, rather than the elder Rudge or Gashford, as the novel's principle villain.

40. Spies and spying actually come up a number of times in the novel. See also 16.180, 17.186, and 57.521. Interestingly enough, the time scheme of the novel makes it likely that Gashford was probably among the spies, eavesdroppers and *agents-provocateurs* who helped to provide the need for and to enforce the Combination Acts, which led to the kind of public mistrust of secrecy that the novel relies upon in its depiction of the 'Prentice Knights.

41. Thom Braun similarly refers to the novel as "untypical of the author" (85). For more of the genesis of the novel, see Braun, 85–90.

42. Quotations from *Sybil* will be cited parenthetically in the text according to book, chapter and page number.

43. Though it provides one of the best general introductions to *Sybil,* reading the novel through the lens of the "new Toryism" proposed by the Young England movement, Richard Levine's *Benjamin Disraeli* critically misreads the novel as endorsing the "Two Nations" doctrine (see, e.g., 77–78). For another good general introduction to the main themes of the novel, see Braun, 91–111.

44. This article offers one of the best early analyses of the complex class dynamic at work in the novel. See also Brantlinger's discussion of the same topic in *The Spirit of Reform,* 97–104.

45. This article is reprinted in a somewhat revised form in *Disraeli's Fiction,* 105–27.

46. Gallagher most clearly articulates this goal on 207.

47. Disraeli's fidelity to historical sources like, in this case, *The Annual Register* of 1838, is well-documented. For his use of Blue Book evidence, see Sheila M. Smith, "Willenhall and Wodgate" and "Blue Books and Victorian Novelists." Lois Bueler's "Disraeli's *Sybil* and Holinshed's *Chronicles*" and Martin Fido's "'From his own Observation'" both add to the list of Disraeli's historical borrowing, proposing Tudor chronicles and William Dodd's *The Factory System Illustrated in a Series of Letters to Lord Ashley,* respectively, as likely sources.

48. As Gallagher observes, "the business of representing a constituency in Parliament is portrayed as a kind of nonrepresentation, which is often conducted through absence rather than presence" (208).

49. Again, Gallagher's comments are instructive: "Disraeli's statesmen . . . are primarily engaged in the activity of creating and interpreting representations; the representations of *Sybil*'s Lord Masque and Mr. Tadpole, however, are not symbols, but lies: lies, moreover, that disguise themselves as the most intimate, secret truths" (208). The emphasis in this passage seems slightly misplaced, however, falling on lies rather than on the telling of lies as a practice of secrecy.

Notes to Chapter 3

1. Dickens is quite careful, however, to inform his readers of his own religious convictions: "However imperfectly those disturbances are set forth in the following pages, they are impartially painted by one who has no sympathy with the Romish Church, though he acknowledges, as most men do, some esteemed friends among the followers of its creed" (40–41).

2. In "Art and Argument," Daniel Schwarz also describes Sybil as "an *emblem* . . . for the potential of the church" (20) and goes on to argue that "Sybil and St. Lys demonstrate the potential of England's religious traditions: the Church of England and the older Catholicism" (21). See also Thom Braun's *Disraeli the Novelist,* 98–99, and Richard Levine's *Benjamin Disraeli,* 95–134, for more on Catholic motifs in *Sybil.*

3. The debate over Maynooth College has received careful attention in a number of works, including Peter Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context,* 90–93; Donal Kerr, *Peel, Priests and Politics;* and Edward R. Norman, *Anti-Catholicism in Victorian England,* 23–51, 144–58.

4. Walter Arnstein, *Catholic versus Protestant in Mid-Victorian England,* 212. Arnstein's point is amply demonstrated by Walter Walsh's paranoid denunciations of Ritualism in *The Secret History of the Oxford Movement:* "It is a significant fact that secrecy has largely characterised the Ritualistic Movement, even from the first year of its existence [1833], when it was known by another name [Tractarianism]. . . . Secret Ritualistic Societies have now come into existence, and are increasing in number every year. At present the Church of England is literally honeycombed with Secret Societies, all working in the interests of the scheme for the Corporate Reunion of the Church of England with the Church of Rome. These secret plotters are the real wire-pullers of the Ritualistic Movement" (xxxix-xl).

5. Though he only discusses English Catholicism, not Anglo-Catholicism, Norman's statement in his Introduction to *The English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century* remains particularly apt: "Two of what Cardinal Wiseman [in *The Religious and Social Position of Catholics in England. An Address Delivered to the Catholic Congress of Malines, August 21, 1863* (1864)] once called the 'three epochs,' each marking 'the date of a step in the progress of English Catholicism'—Catholic Emancipation in 1829, the enlarged episcopate of 1840, and the Restoration of the Hierarchy in 1850—were accompanied by public displays of hostility to indications of Catholic growth" (2).

6. Wendy Hinde describes the Catholic questions as "the most intractable and divisive issue in English domestic politics for the first thirty years of the nineteenth century" (vii). Similarly, Edward R. Norman, in *The English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century,* writes, "The union of the throne and altar, the settlement of property, the stability of institutions, the very political freedoms which Englishmen so cherished, seemed all to be related to the maintenance of the Protestant Constitution" (31).

7. See Norman, *Roman Catholicism in England,* 3–4; and *The English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century,* 10.

8. For more on the collapse of contemporality implied by this use of past events, see Norman, *The English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century,* 16–17.

9. Of course England also had a long literary tradition of anti-Catholicism that was reproduced and expanded in the nineteenth century by such lurid titles as *On the Education of Roman Catholic Children and the Rejection of the Bible by Their Priests* (1816), *Forty Popish Frauds* (1835), *The Errors of Romanism Traced to Their Origin in Human Nature* (1844) and literally hundreds of others. Their tone is admirably exemplified by an article in the founding issue of *Fraser's Magazine:* "of all known sects or pretended religions at this day in Christendom, POPERY IS THE ONLY, OR THE GREATEST HERESY; and he who is forward to brand all others for heretics, THE OBSTINATE PAPIST, IS THE ONLY HERETIC" (22). For more on the historical longevity of anti-Catholicism in England, see Norman, *Anti-Catholicism in Victorian England,* the first monograph-length study of this topic and the recipient of the prestigious Thirlwall Essay Prize for 1967; Sheridan Gilley, "Roman Catholicism," which offers a brief and well-annotated history of Victorian Roman Catholicism, concentrating especially on the increasing presence of Roman Catholics in Victorian England and on competing figures with the English Catholic revival; and D. G. Paz, *Popular Anti-Catholicism in Mid-Victorian England,* which investigates "what led

ordinary people to become anti-Catholic" in order to construct a "systematic and comprehensive" explanation for "the persistence of anti-Catholicism over time" (18).

10. For more on the power of Irish organization in the 1820s, see chapter 4, "Ireland on the Brink," of Hinde's *Catholic Emancipation,* 99–127.

11. My account of this debate is necessarily selective. For a complete blow-by-blow, and almost day-by-day, narrative of the events leading to the Catholic Emancipation Act, see Hinde's *Catholic Emancipation.*

12. Mr. Goulburn's comments are recorded in *The Annual Register, 1829:* "But there had lately arisen in that country [Ireland] a combination which extended itself throughout every class of the Catholic community, with an organization unexampled in other countries, or amongst other political societies, and whose principle hostility was directed at the Established Church" (41).

13. Earlier, the article had left little doubt that emancipation was not among the kinds of "measures" it proposed: "Let not the English Protestant, after he has achieved what he has done—after he has reached the proud and glorious point of elevation on which he stands, now voluntarily degrade himself into the inferior and bondsman of the Irish Catholic. Let not England, after having fought and triumphed over the world—after having shed her blood like water, and thrown away her treasures like dust, to gain the magnificent and commanding stature she enjoys, now suffer herself to be vanquished, ruined, and enslaved, by this polluted, profligate, and contemptible domestic enemy" (44).

14. This article offers a point-by-point refutation of the claims made against Catholic emancipation and provides an excellent introduction to the topic.

15. See *The Annual Register, 1829,* 3, 4. See also 25 April 1829, 80, in the "Chronicle" section, where a "Seditious Placard" accuses both men of treason.

16. For similar sentiments, see also "Substance of Sir Robert Inglis's Two Speeches on the Catholic Question," 811; and "The Supremacy of the Church of Rome not Acknowledged by the British Christians Till the Ninth Century," 345.

17. The Catholic Emancipation Act has been reprinted several times: see, for example, *The Annual Register, 1829,* "Public Documents," 367–77; or Norman, *Anti-Catholicism in Victorian England,* 131–39. An abridged version can also be found in R. Flindall, ed., *The Church of England 1815–1948,* 29–31.

18. The Protestant MPs' oath has also been reprinted a number of times. See, e.g., Norman, *The English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century,* 52; or Hinde, 161. Not until April 1866 were denominationally-specific oaths replaced by a simple declaration of allegiance to the crown: "I, A. B., do swear that I will be faithful to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, her heirs and successors according to law, so help me God."

19. The provision in the oath that the Catholic MP would not attempt to subvert the present church establishment occasionally provided reactionary Protestants with the grounds for accusing liberal Catholics of casuistry whenever they attempted to address religious reform (see, for example, *The Annual Register, 1838,* 103).

20. These provisions all turned out to be a dead letter, but their very inclusion points to the degree to which the figure of the secret society could influence the Act's writers.

21. One of the few exceptions to this universal distrust of the Jesuits comes from a qualified criticism of the religious orders sections of the Act in the *Foreign Quarterly Review:* "If we could have wished any part of the act expunged, it would have been the clauses relating to the Jesuits—not because we approve of their institution, but, because, being convinced that they can do no harm, their suppression appears to manifest suspicion, and to detract . . . from that general acquiescence from which other provisions of the act were received . . . they could do little mischief in this age or nation, even by the exercise of their former arts and intrigues. The Jesuits are no longer . . . the soul of every traitorous plot, and the assertors of papal encroachment" ("Foreign Views of the Catholic Question," 305).

22. Anti-Jesuit sentiments also penetrated English society at its most respectable levels, as demonstrated by Dr. Thomas Arnold's comments to "An Old Pupil" in a letter dated 28 February 1838: "No man can doubt the piety of Loyola and many of his followers; yet, what Christian, in England at least, can doubt that, as Jesuitism, it was not of God; that it was grounded on falsehood, and strove to propagate falsehood?" (Stanley II: 110). Carlyle also operates within this tradition when he writes in 1850, "Where you meet a man believing in the salutary nature of falsehoods, or the divine authority of things doubtful, and fancying that to serve the Good Cause he must call the Devil to his aid, there is a follower of Unsaint Ignatius" (*Works,* 20: 305).

23. For example: "The form of national government, the Jesuits prefer, is undoubtedly despotic, so long as this, the most centralized of all forms of government, is really under their command. . . . The progress of civilization and increased rapidity of communication have tended to shorten the periods of their successes in the maintenance of avowed despotisms. Still, being perfectly indifferent to the amount of human and national suffering they occasion, in their warfare against freedom, a brief enjoyment of the control over the depositories of absolute power has attractions for them, which they either cannot or will not resist" (Newdegate, ix); and "Reference has been made to attempts at assassination, attributed to the Jesuits, as well as to those historically known to have been perpetrated by them. None seems too elevated for the malevolent designs of those conspirators" (Newdegate, lix).

24. Though written forty years after the Catholic Relief Act, Newdegate's exposé still offers a relevant example of anti-Jesuit feeling in the 1820s, both because of the remarkable continuity of anti-Jesuitism in England over time, and because Newdegate's own politics remained largely mired in early nineteenth-century Toryism. For more on Newdegate's politics, see Walter Arnstein's *Protestant versus Catholic in Victorian England.*

25. Newdegate writes that "the intensity of their combination, and the secresy, with which it is enforced, enables the Great Secret Society to grapple with the most powerful Governments in the world" (xi).

26. For a brief account of the Hampden controversy, see John Shelton Reed's *Glorious Battle,* 9–10. See also R. W. Church's *The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years,* 159–76.

27. The attribution of irrationality to Catholicism also evokes the similar charges of irrationality leveled at trade unions and connected to the practice of secrecy.

28. Passages from *Tracts for the Times* will be given according to volume, tract and page number, respectively.

29. This article is actually a response to the publication of Froude's *Remains* that same year, but it provides the clearest example of the way in which anti-Catholic rhetoric and accusations of Jesuitism could be directed at the Tractarians.

30. See Arnstein, 214. For further background, see Walter Ralls, "The Papal Aggression of 1850."

31. See Flindall, 116. One contemporary example of these fears of a French plot appears in "The Popish Partition of England." English Protestants could even cite the Pope's exactly contemporary excommunication of Sardinia as an example of the threat to national sovereignty that could be posed by closer religious ties with the Papacy. The relevance of this example might be questioned, however, as J. R. Beard would do as early as January, 1851 in *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine.*

32. The Papal Brief is reprinted in the "State Papers" section of *The Annual Register, 1850,* 405–11.

33. The "Durham Letter" was widely reproduced, including in *The Annual Register, 1850,* 198–99. For more on the events surrounding "papal aggression," see Holmes, 74–103; Norman, *Anti-Catholicism in Victorian England,* 52–79; and Arnstein, 40–61.

34. *The Annual Register, 1850* sums up the deleterious effect of Wiseman's pastoral: "If the national sensibilities and independence of the English people were wounded by the Papal Brief, the offence was tenfold aggravated by the style and tenour of the Cardinal's Pastoral" (197). The pastoral itself is reprinted in the "State Papers" section, 411–414.

35. *The Times* (October 14, 1850), editorial, 4. Because of the potential confusion arising from parenthetical documentation, references to *The Times* will be provided in the notes.

36. *The Times* (October 22, 1850), leading editorial, 4. This editorial even went so far as to suggest that the fact that the government had known about plans for a Roman Catholic restoration for three years might be a sign of conspiratorial maneuvering by Lord Minto, sent as a diplomat to Rome in 1847.

37. *The Times* (October 24, 1850), second editorial, 4.

38. *The Times* (October 19, 1850), leading editorial, 4. Even in its most scathing denunciations of "foreign despotism" and "spiritual aggression," however, *The Times* was careful to limit the range of its attacks to Rome only: "It is not, indeed, to the English Catholics so much as to the see of Rome itself that these objections may be fairly addressed; for our Roman Catholic countrymen have as a body probably no active part in these proceedings of the alien authority which they acknowledge" (*The Times,* October 19, 1850, 4).

39. The first of these articles contains sermon extracts delivered by Anglican clergymen on 5 November and the second, a letter to the editor, reexamines the role of Jesuit conspirators in the plot. A complete list of all the items in *The Times* relating to "papal aggression" printed between the paper's first editorial on 14 October and Wiseman's declaration of loyalty on behalf of English Catholics, entitled "The Queen and the Pope," on 16 November can be found in the list of works cited.

40. This article, like a number of others, was not so much interested in the restoration of the hierarchy as in both attacking the Anglo-Catholics in the Established church who had made this

restoration seem possible to Rome and urging disestablishment. For more on these topics, see also "The Anglo-Catholic Theory" and "Royal Supremacy and Papal Aggression."

41. As with *The Times,* however, the reviewer was careful to assert, "We do not mean here to charge our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects with any of these diabolical intentions—far from it" (579). On this subject, *Blackwood's* was even in agreement with the *Edinburgh Review,* which also declared "we do not for a moment question either the loyalty or the patriotism of the mass of our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects" ("Ultramontane Doubts," 538).

42. Relevant articles in the *Dublin Review* include "Catholicism, a Conservative Principle" and "The Hierarchy."

43. Beard's other articles are "March Gales and the Government" and "Parliamentary Session of 1851," both of which argue against the impending Ecclesiastical Titles Act.

44. Beard perceptively continues, noting that "other people would never have heard about it, if it had been that, just at the time of the appointments, the London newspapers were (on good grounds) ill-disposed towards the Pope and Popery [because of Sardinia], and had nothing else to occupy them" (47).

45. Like Beard's later articles, Newman's *Lectures* were written during the debate over the Ecclesiastical Titles Act (14 & 15 Vict., c. 49), which had been introduced on 14 February 1851 and would be made law 1 August 1851. The Act is reprinted on 457–59 of the "Public Documents" section of *The Annual Register, 1851.* For more on the historical context of the *Lectures* and an interesting discussion of their surprising melding of genres, see A. O. J. Cockshut's "The Literary and Historical Significance of the *Present Position of Catholics.*" All quotations from the *Lectures* themselves will be cited parenthetically in the text according to page numbers from the 1899 Longman's edition.

46. Responding to Newman's wit, David DeLaura even refers to the *Lectures* as "perhaps the finest sustained comic performance in his writings" (129).

47. Newman does not hesitate to declare his loyalty to and respect for what he calls "the possession, and so deservedly the glory, of our own people; and in so taking it I need hardly say, I take it for the very reason that it is so rightfully the object of our wonder and veneration" (25).

48. Evaluated from a purely political viewpoint, Newman's strategy in the *Lectures* was unsuccessful—even the masterful caricature of English anti-Catholicism as Russian anti-John-Bullism was insufficient to prevent the passage of the Ecclesiastical Titles Act two months later. However, the fact that the Act remained practically a dead letter, since its provision allowing Roman Catholic prelates with spurious titles to be fined 100 pounds was never enforced, suggests that Newman's appeal to extra-political standards of value was partially effective.

49. The exception to this internationalization of anti-Catholic rhetoric was the continued denunciation of Tractarianism, and later Ritualism, within the Established Church. However, the earlier quotation from Walsh's *Secret History* shows the ambivalence about such a domestication of the Catholic threat: Walsh attempts to show how the Established Church is virtually overrun by Secret Societies dedicated to the foreign agenda of Rome. To a certain extent, then, even Ritualism was made as foreign as possible. For more on Tractarianism and Anglo-Catholicism after

1850, see Norman, *Anti-Catholicism in Victorian England,* 105–21; Rowell, *The Vision Glorious;* Reed, *Glorious Battle;* and Pickering, *Anglo-Catholicism.*

Notes to Chapter 4

1. See, for example, the narrator's musings during a brief break in Ali's recitation on 262–64.

2. For more on Taylor's novel, see Brantlinger, *Rule of Darkness,* 86–90; and Joved Majeed, "Meadows Taylor's *Confessions of a Thug.*"

3. John William Kaye, author of perhaps the foremost nineteenth-century account of the Mutiny, writes that this strategic declaration and the capture of Delhi "imparted a political, a national significance to a movement, which otherwise might have been regarded as little more than a local outbreak" (II: 120). Kaye's three-volume *History of the Sepoy War* offers a day-by-day and region-by-region account of the events leading up to the Mutiny and its progress through September, 1857. It also contains an outstanding fold-out map of Oude and its environs, with all of the locales significant to the progress of the Mutiny marked and labeled with their nineteenth-century British spellings. Kaye's work is succeeded and to a certain extent challenged by Colonel G. B. Malleson's three-volume *History of the Indian Mutiny, 1857–58,* which narrates events through the close of the Mutiny in 1858.

4. By the end of June British troops and civilians had been driven from or imperiled in Delhi (11 May), Aligurh (20 May), Etawah (21 May), Nusseerabad (28 May), Lucknow (30 May), Bareilly (31 May), Bhurtpore (31 May), Shahjehanpore (31 May), Budaon (1 June), Seetapore (3 June), Mohumdee (4 June), Neemuch (4 June), Allahabad (6 June), Jhansi (7 June), Fyzabad (8 June), Jaunpore (8 June), Sultanpore (8 June), Futtehpore (9 June), Naogong (10 June), Gwalior (14 June), Mozuffernugger (14 June), Furruckabad (18 June), and Cawnpore (27 June).

5. The Well of Cawnpore incident (15 July) is only the most famous of the many atrocities committed by both sides during the Mutiny and was probably carried out in response to British brutality during the retaking of Allahabad (15–18 June). For more on the rhetorical and emotional significance of the Well of Cawnpore in England see Patrick Brantlinger's *Rule of Darkness,* 199–224.

6. By the end of August, British troops had defeated rebel forces at Etawah (24 May), Budleeka-Serai (8 June), Allahabad (18 June), Trimmoo Ghout (12 July), Futtehpore (13 July), Aong (15 July), Cawnpore (17 July), Arrah (3 August), Judgespore (11 August), Aligurh (24 August), and Nujuhfgurh (25 August). Many of the smaller towns originally occupied by the rebels had also been abandoned by this point.

7. As Jenny Sharpe writes, "By attributing the origins of the rebellion to the fear of technology [the Enfield rifle], colonial explanations represent the Mutiny as a war between religious fanaticism and Reason" (60). An excellent example of how "the affair of the greased cartridges" could translate into a view of Indians as fanatical and mentally deficient savages can be found in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Review:* "The Sepoy is in general childishly ignorant. . . . To this cause may in great mea-

sure be attributed the readiness with which the cartridge grievance was accepted, and the atrocious outburst of 'heathen rage' that ensues" ("The Company's Raj," 633).

8. At least one reviewer agreed with him, writing that "cartridges alone would never have done the mischief, had not the minds of men been prepared for revolt by a combination of causes. Yet there is no cause, alone and singular. The whole system of the native army was rotten at the core" ("The English in India," 196).

9. One article denied outright that the annexation of Oude had anything to do with the Mutiny: "It is a pure absurdity to speak of the mutiny as occasioned by the annexation [of Oude]. The mutineers, at least, who should know the truth, have never said so. In all their recorded sayings and published proclamations, there is not a word of accusation against the Government on the score of rapacity and oppression—those sins being purely and entirely the invention of Fast-day preachers, platform-humanitarians, and all that large class of the ignorant 'unco'guid,' who practiced that easiest of all virtues—the confession of other men's sins" ("The English in India," 198).

10. "It is impossible to calculate the saving of human life which has resulted from the British conquest of that country, if it was only through the stopping of murders by authority" ("The Sepoy Rebellion," 254).

11. "The benefits already conferred on the unhappy Out-castes by English rule are incalculable. Admitted into European families as domestic servants, they are at once raised into a new position; received by Missionaries into schools, they are proved to have the mental qualities of a man" ("The Sepoy Rebellion," 221).

12. Indeed, for some writers, Britain's benevolent elevation of the natives did not go far enough because it did not include more active evangelism supported by the government. In fact, one reviewer credited this inconsistent application of principle with fomenting the Mutiny: "The constantly avowed policy was to introduce inventions, science, all material improvements openly, and Christianity by stealth. To this day many persons of experience think themselves profound and far-seeing in advocating the continuance of this course; though their stealth is the parent of the distrust which has exposed the Sepoys to the seduction of conspirators. Stealth is not English; stealth is not Christian, and that is enough. Stealth begets ignorance and suspicion; and we want knowledge and confidence" ("Crisis of the Sepoy Rebellion," 537).

13. See, for example, "The Sepoy Rebellion," 223.

14. In an attempt to answer this question, the author attributed the Mutiny to the possibility that "the Asiatic mind is incapable of analysing motives, or drawing a distinction between clemency and weakness" (258), but even this explanation suggests that more dissatisfaction was behind the events of 1857 than he wished to admit. As Ainslee T. Embree writes in one of the most helpfully sized introductions to the range of opinion surrounding the Indian Mutiny, the position taken by the *Bentley's* author was appealing because "it permitted the continuance of the belief that British rule in India had not awakened any deep antagonism," thus precluding any examination of "the presuppositions that had been used to explain the nature of British power" (viii). Embree's *1857 in India* offers not only a succinct overview of events and their subsequent transformation

in political discourse but also a wide range of nineteenth and twentieth-century examples of that discursive range.

15. According to Viswanathan's argument, such alleged fears that England sought the wholesale conversion of India to Christianity would have been misplaced, since English policy tended not towards religious conversion, but rather towards weakening the practice of Indian religions in the name of secularization.

16. "There appears little doubt now that a widely ramified conspiracy had been arranged to seize Calcutta and restore the Muhammadan rule, and that it failed more through accident than any display of energy on the part of the European officers. But though the conspiracy was thus forced into a different direction, it speedily burst forth in all its hideous strength" ("Our Indian Empire," *Bentley's Miscellany,* 260).

"To crown all, we are informed by the last mail that papers have fallen into the hands of Government, implying an extensive conspiracy among the natives to overthrow the British dominion. A plan of Calcutta is said to have been found marked out for simultaneous attack, and the deposed King of Oude is in custody on suspicion of complicity in the plot" ("The Bengal Mutiny," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine,* 385).

17. The following lengthy quotation from an article in the November, 1857 issue of *Fraser's Magazine* makes clear what exactly is at stake in thus characterizing the Mutiny as the result of a conspiracy: "Again, as the very openness of the mutiny revealed the sources of disaffection, it was gradually discovered that the mainspring was not religious, nor hardly military, but political. That a plot had for some time been forming, which had for its object the restoration of the Emperor of Delhi, cannot be questioned. Nor does there seem ground for doubting the complicity of the King of Oude, who with one hand was despatching emissaries to Lucknow, and with the other laying petitions before the Houses of Parliament, thus, as it appears to us, the mutiny of the army was a mutiny for political objects, cloaked by a religious grievance, which was speedily abandoned, but without any *primary* connexion with civil insubordination and discontent" ("The Indian Mutinies," 628). In other words, by attributing the Mutiny to the plotting of a general conspiracy involving several Muslim leaders, not only could the agency of India's people be neatly effaced, but their rebellious actions could be severed from any anti-imperial grievances.

18. All this is not to say that there were no plans to overthrow British rule in India, but rather that by publicizing them within the rhetoric of the figure of the secret society English writers effectively transformed a potential revolution into another morally reprehensible instance of, in the words of one English periodical writer, "dissimulation displayed by these perfidious Asiatics" ("The Government of India and the Mutinies," 490).

19. He had already proposed this possibility in fewer words on 17 July 1857 (*Hansard,* 146: 1709).

20. Lord John Russell's remarks were designed to diminish the threat of potential conspiracies, but the fact that he had to do so while speaking on the floor of the House indicates just how much credence conspiracy theories were generating in the debate over the Indian Mutiny.

21. See "The Sepoy Rebellion," 225, 226, 237, 238, 246, and 249. For another general reference to a conspiracy, see "The Government of India and the Mutinies," 488.

22. The idea of a Russian plot was never without its critics, most of whom justifiably complained of a lack of factual basis; see, for example, the following refutation in *Blackwood's:* "we dismiss at the outset all idea of Russian instigation. Though suggested in some of the Indian journals, and insinuated in Parliament by no less an authority than the Chairman of the East India Company, we can find no warrant for this suspicion in any of the facts or papers before us" ("The Bengal Mutiny," 387).

23. For more references to the *chupatties,* see "The English in India," 197; "The Indian Mutinies" (August 1857), 238; and *The Annual Register, 1857,* 245.

24. The question of whether or not there was a factual conspiracy or even a secret society behind the events of 1857–58 is addressed in numerous histories of the Mutiny. See, e.g., Embree, ix; Kaye, Vol. 2, 108–110; and Majumdar, 337–82.

25. For more on the Sepoys as both bestial and childlike, see *The Annual Register, 1857,* 251; and "A Familiar Epistle from Mr John Company to Mr John Bull," 246.

26. A more moderate, but still no less damaging view of Indian Hindus emerged from a December, 1857 article in *Blackwood's* on "The Religions of India." While initially this looks unrelated to the Mutiny, the article actually participated in the campaign to highlight Indian primitiveness, and thereby to justify denying them democratic rights. Its opening sentences read: "India is pre-eminently a Land of Idols and of strange gods. Polytheism, and its never-failing attendant, idolatry, which in modern times have disappeared so much from the face of the earth, still exist in pristine vigour in the Indian peninsula" ("The Religions of India," 743).

27. These stereotypes endured in British policy long after the Mutiny, making Britain particularly ill-equipped to cope with the later Indian independence movement. For the effects of popular stereotypes of Indians on British thinking after the Mutiny, see Thomas Metcalf's *The Aftermath of Revolt.*

28. A copy of the Act of Parliament that enabled this transfer of authority can be found in the Public Documents section of *The Annual Register, 1858,* beginning on 226. In his brief, encyclopedic account, "After the Mutiny: From Queen to Queen Empress," David Washbrook takes a somewhat different view of the effects of this transfer of power from the East India Company to the British government. He asserts that this initial assumption of control of the subcontinent by the British government was actually a liberating change for native Indians, who were given unprecedented opportunities to participate in their own government, and that only after Victoria was crowned Empress of India in 1877 was such popular involvement sharply curtailed. However, Washbrook's account offers little evidence to support this claim, which seems strangely at odds with the racist constructions of India promulgated in the aftermath of the Mutiny.

29. Mutiny literature also serves as the focus of Steve Attridge, "Echoes of Empire III: Dis-Orientated Fiction," and Nancy Paxton, "Mobilizing Chivalry: Rape in British Novels About the Indian Uprising of 1857." Attridge's article, which actually precedes Brantlinger's account in *Rule of Darkness,* takes a similar approach towards Mutiny novels of the 1890s, using Edward Said's work in *Orientalism*

to argue that these novels work to enforce a "textual possession" of India that helps to rationalize the Indian Mutiny. Attridge also performs brief readings of several twentieth-century novels that work against this tradition. Nancy Paxton adds a feminist hermeneutic to these approaches to Mutiny literature, arguing that the frequent motif of rape in novels written after the Mutiny manages the demands of English women and Indian men for greater autonomy. According to Paxton, rape simultaneously robs both groups of their potential for full citizenship by portraying English women as helpless victims and Indian men as unlawful savages, even as it places English men in the role of chivalrous protectors, or, using the terms of democratic debate, guardians.

30. These and other contemporary plays, melodramas and military dramas are cited in Brantlinger, *Rule of Darkness,* 205–6.

31. See Brantlinger, *Rule of Darkness,* 208–11.

32. Brantlinger discusses *Cawnpore* on 202–4 of *Rule of Darkness.*

33. Dickens's initial reaction to the Indian Mutiny is well known, and can be found in a letter written to Angela Burdett Coutts, dated 4 October 1857: "I wish I were Commander in Chief in India. . . . I should do my utmost to exterminate the Race upon whom the stain of the late cruelties rested . . . to blot it out of mankind and raze it off the face of the Earth" (*Letters,* 2: 889).

34. For a somewhat different approach to "Perils," see Lillian Nayder, "Class Consciousness and the Indian Mutiny in Dickens's 'The Perils of Certain English Prisoners.'"

35. As the editor of *Household Words,* Dickens himself would have been intimately familiar with the rhetorical tendencies of British accounts of the Mutiny. Between 4 July 1857 and 12 June 1858 (Vols. 16 and 17), the Contents page for *Household Words* lists 33 entries for India(n), including one article in no. 399 (Saturday, November 14, 1857), "Wanderings in India," that refers to both Indian Thuggee (on 457–58) and the Nena [Nana] Sahib (on 458–63). For more on Dickens and the Indian Mutiny, see William Oddie, "Dickens and the Indian Mutiny" and Jeremy Tambling, *Dickens, Violence and the Modern State.*

36. Collins's choice of diamonds has been the subject of at least two twentieth-century articles, Mark Hennelly's "Detecting Collins' Diamond" and William Burgan's "Masonic Symbolism in *The Moonstone* and *The Mystery of Edwin Drood.*" Burgan's article is of particular interest since it situates the issue of the diamond within a larger pattern of Freemasonry in the novel.

37. One of the first critics to notice the novel's imperial subtext was John Reed, whose 1973 essay, "English Imperialism and the Unacknowledged Crime of *The Moonstone,*" helped to pave the way for future interpretations of the novel's stance on the issue of empire.

38. Quotations from *The Moonstone* will be cited parenthetically in the text according to period, narrative, chapter and page number.

39. See, for example, First Period, chapter 5, 32.

40. As an idea of the scope of opium production in India during the Indian Mutiny, opium accounted for roughly 20 percent of Britain's total Indian revenue, or £16,335,606 between 1857–59 (*The Annual Register, 1859,* 30–31). For more on the real and symbolic presence of opium in England, see Alethea Hayter, *Opium and the Romantic Imagination.*

41. Lillian Nader writes that this overlap of sexual and imperial themes through the person of Franklin Blake "illuminates the paradox of Victorian guardianship, in both its patriarchal and its imperial guises. As Rachel's prospective husband, he promises to protect his future wife, while stripping her of her sexual and legal autonomy and her property rights. As an Englishman with ties to 'the Honourable John,' he promises to civilize India, while exploiting its people and claiming its wealth for his own" (Nayder, 122).

42. See also Nayder, 119.

43. As this subtle usage of dating suggests, Collins did extensive background research on India before writing *The Moonstone.* His notes can be found in the Morris L. Parish Collection at Princeton University.

44. Further examples of Crusoemancy can be found on I.i.10.83, II.iii.2.329, and II.iv.6/20.454.

45. Lillian Nayder also notes that Betteridge's devotion to *Robinson Crusoe* is amusingly ironic in another way, in that Betteridge automatically identifies with Crusoe even though he is himself a servant: "In a novel about imperial crime, it proves to be one of Collins's central ironies that Betteridge valorizes Defoe's idyll of empire building, *Robinson Crusoe,* while misapplying its tale of mastery and subservience to his own case. Persistently quoting from Defoe's work, Betteridge is identified with Crusoe, overlooking his ties to Friday" (*Wilkie Collins,* 123).

46. This passage comes from Ezra Jennings's journal, which is not divided into chapters as the other narratives are, but rather into dates, and sometimes into hours. Passages from the Fourth Narrative will therefore be cited according to the dates in his journal, the time (when necessary), and the pages in the Oxford edition of the novel.

47. Jennings reveals his birthplace and background to Franklin Blake on II.iii.9.411.

48. This reenactment is carefully staged to appeal to scientific authorities as well, as Ezra Jennings's appeals to the theories of Dr. John Brown (413), William Benjamin Carpenter (432), and Dr. John Elliotson (433) make clear. For more on Collins's use of contemporary science, see Ira Nadel's "Science and *The Moonstone,*" Jenny Bourne Taylor's *In the Secret Theatre of Home,* 174–206, and Ronald Thomas's "Minding the Body Politic."

49. The novel allows a glimpse of this possibility in Mr. Bruff's narrative. One of the Indians comes to visit him at his office in order to inquire about the terms of money-lending in England, and Bruff feels "bound to testify that he was the perfect model of a client. He might not have respected my life. But he did what none of my own countrymen had ever done, in all my experience with them—he respected my time" (II.ii.2.310).

50. See Miller's reading of *The Moonstone* in *The Novel and the Police,* 37–54, especially 40–42.

51. Elisabeth Rose Gruner examines the role family secrecy plays in the novel in her "Family Secrets and the Mysteries of the Moonstone." She writes, "Drugs, imperialism, and theft are subsumed into the larger question of family relations (cousinly or closer) which is at the heart of *The Moonstone*. What is the Victorian family and whose purposes does it serve? Collins asks, and the answer does not come back in the family's favor" (127).

Notes to Chapter 5

1. For more on these and other Italian secret societies, see Heckethorn, vol. I, 264–76 and vol. II, 72–77, 157–95; and MacKenzie, 172–73, 195–201. They are also mentioned briefly in Holt, 44–47.

2. For more on the Fenians, see Heckethorn, vol. II, 275–87; and MacKenzie, 186–94.

3. The background given here and elsewhere in the chapter on Italian unification is necessarily abridged. I have gathered the facts primarily from Shepard B. Clough and Salvatore Saladino, *A History of Modern Italy,* whose own approach to the period through documents written by and about those actually participating in the *Risorgimento* gives a sense of what unification meant to those involved. These facts have been checked against accounts found in Albrecht-Carrié, *Italy from Napoleon to Mussolini;* Edgar Holt, *Risorgimento;* and Clara M. Lovett, *The Democratic Movement in Italy 1830–1876.* Italian unification has long been a contested site for historiography, with early writers often interpreting the process as the apotheosis of liberal principle, whereas more recent critics have noted the contradictions and political shortcomings of Italy's resurgence. A brief and helpful survey of these trends in the historiography of Italian unification through 1984 appears in John A. Davis, "Reading History: Italian Unification." A more thorough overview of shifts in historical thinking about Italy through 1972, two years after the republication of Rosario Romero's influential *Il Risorgimento in Sicilia,* can be found in Agatha Ramm, "The Risorgimento in Sicily: Recent Literature." See Dennis Mack Smith, "The Unification of Italy: Some Myths Re-examined" and William C. Mills, "Unity Deferred: The 'Roman Question' in Italian History, 1861–82" for two examples of the new historiography in practice.

4. For contemporary military historians' account of the war with Austria, see "The Italian Campaign of 1859" and "The Campaign in Italy."

5. England was not lacking in contemporary accounts detailing the background to unification. A particularly well-informed and fairly unbiased summary of Italy affairs from 1856 onwards appears in "Tidings from Turin," while background on both French and Austrian relations with Italy since 1815 can be found in "Foreign Affairs—War in Italy," which paints both imperial powers as dictatorial.

6. Similar fears of French intentions can be found not only in periodical articles like "Napoleonism and Italy," but also in more literary productions of the same period. Two poems by Tennyson, for example—"Rifleman Form!" (published 9 May 1859) and "Jack Tar" (written by 14 May 1859)—both express anxiety over a possibly incipient war with France.

7. In *England Against the Papacy, 1858–61,* C. T. McIntire offers an insightful and well-referenced analysis of the specific debate in England over how to curtail Papal power in Italy during the early years of unification. McIntire contextualizes this debate within the concurrent struggle for political power between Tories and Liberals in Parliament, thereby adding yet another layer of ideological impurity to England's already compromised response to the Italian Question. According

to McIntire, both Tories and Liberals agreed that Papal government was completely inappropriate for a modern state, but each party adopted its own strategy to ameliorate the situation, with the Tories first attempting a policy of rapprochement with the Pope and the Liberals later tacitly supporting the annexation of the Papal States by Piedmont.

8. See "Napoleonism and Italy," 261; and "Papers on the Italian Question," 542.

9. In general, this article is heavily invested in chronicling Mazzini's decline throughout the Italian peninsula, thereby allaying English fears of radical republicanism in a united Italy. The article is also concerned to attribute most of Italy's progress towards independence to Count Cavour, whom it represents in glowing terms. After his death Cavour actually became the object of an almost Garibaldian hero-worship; this sentiment is evident in "The Neapolitan and Roman Question" and also in Menella Bute Smedley's contemporary poem, "Cavour." More recently, Nick Carter has challenged the iconic status of Piedmont's scheming Prime Minister, arguing that Cavour's success was more serendipitous than anything else and that his skills as a statesman have been overblown.

10. *Macmillan's* is generally quite friendly to Italian unification and even to Mazzini, who is often portrayed as the heroic embodiment of the national ideal.

11. For English hero-worship of Garibaldi in 1859–60, see "The Struggle at Melazzo," "The Situation of the Moment in Italy," and "Garibaldi and the Italian Volunteers." Like Cavour, Garibaldi has also undergone revisions in recent histories; see, for example, Lucy Riall, "Hero, Saint, or Revolutionary? Nineteenth-Century Politics and the Cult of Garibaldi."

12. For Collins's use of the Rugeley murder case, see John Sutherland, "Wilkie Collins and the Origins of the Sensation Novel"; the similarities between the plight of Anne Catherick and that of the Marquise de Drouhault were first noted by Clyde K. Hyder in "Wilkie Collins and *The Woman in White*."

13. It is important to note that *The Woman in White* engages with more than just the Italian Question. It represents a novelistic intervention into legal debates over the definition of lunacy and the rights of married women to own property and to file for divorce, as well as the exigencies of novel publication and the social implications of a female-majority population. For more on Collins and the lunacy debate, see Jenny Bourne Taylor, 98–130 and Barbara Fass Leavy, "Wilkie Collins's Cinderella"; on the influence of current debates over divorce and married women's property, see Nayder, *Wilkie Collins,* 74–85; on the novel's reflection of the circumstances of publication, see Gwendolyn MacDonagh, "'Fill Up All the Gaps'"; and on Collins's approach to the problem of "surplus women," see Susan Balée, "Wilkie Collins and Surplus Women."

14. These articles were, in order, "Austria" (18 June), "Viva L'Italia!" (9 July), "Piedmont" (16 July), and "North Italian Character" (10 September). Lillian Nayder uses these articles as one point of entry into the "agents of Empire" present in the novel. In her highly perceptive examination of the imperial implications of *The Woman in White* she also notes that Collins had already written a similar piece for *Household Words* in 1856 entitled "My Black Mirror," and that he was acquainted with Italian revolutionaries living in London, including the father of Dante Gabriel Rossetti, an exiled member of the Carbonari and, according to Julian Symons' notes to the Penguin edition of the novel, possibly the original of Pesca.

15. Walter actually refers to this process of foreign immigration twice, once while explaining the presence of Mrs. Rubelle in England (on 439), and later at greater length during his investigation of Fosco: "The year of which I am now writing was the year of the famous Crystal Palace Exhibition in Hyde Park. Foreigners in unusually large numbers had arrived already, and were still arriving in England. Men were among us by the hundred whom the ceaseless distrustfulness of their governments had followed privately, by means of appointed agents, to our shores" (584).

16. In "Witnesses and Truth," Adele Wills argues that Collins's technique of legalistic narration in both *The Moonstone* and *The Woman in White* allows him to call upon contemporary legal definitions of truth to "redress the balance, and reinterpret social assumptions" about a variety of societal Others (on 93). Certainly, one can see this process at work in *The Moonstone,* in which the racial marginalized Indians become agents of English law by the end of the novel; however, *The Woman in White* seems to me to problematize Wills's argument, not only because the narration is wholly controlled by Walter Hartwright, who seeks to naturalize his own rise to the upper-middle class, but also because the character in the story who most benefits from his opportunity to speak, Count Fosco, hardly qualifies as a marginalized Other.

17. Critics have noticed this tendency towards interested self-effacement. See, for example, Pamela Perkins and Mary Donaghy, "A Man's Resolution."

18. At the vestry fire, during the unsuccessful rescue of Sir Percival, Hartright "hardly knowing what I did, acting desperately on the first impulse that occurred to me," smashes the skylight, thereby letting "out the flame instead of letting in the air" and guaranteeing Sir Percival's demise (536). During his reconstruction of Sir Percival's last moments, Walter proposes that "He must have dropped in his death-swoon, he must have sunk in the place where he was found, just as I got on the roof to break the skylight window" (544), thus occluding his own potential responsibility for killing the baronet.

19. Viewed from Walter's perspective as narrator, this elevation of Fosco into a double of himself is necessary to hold the story together. In order to secure his role as hero, Walter must match wits with a villain of suitable stature; in order to keep his readers' sensations at a fever pitch, he must also provide them with secrets in need of revelation. Fosco serves both purposes at once, acting as an almost-unbeatable foe whose power derives precisely from his ability to keep secrets. Unfortunately for Walter, most critics, following U. C. Knoepflmacher's argument in "The Counterworld of Victorian Fiction," agree that this portrayal of Fosco works too well, that, in fact, Fosco emerges as a more interesting and attractive character than Walter himself.

20. Fosco stands no lower in his own estimation, as evidenced by his indignant riposte to Glyde's imputation that he will "worm out" the secret of Anne Catherick: "'Percival! Percival!' he cried passionately, 'do you know me no better than that? Has all your experience shown you nothing of my character yet? I am a man of the antique type! I am capable of the most exalted acts of virtue —when I have the chance of performing them. It has been the misfortune of my life that I have had few chances. My conception of friendship is sublime! Is it my fault that your skeleton has peeped out at me? Why do I confess my curiosity? You poor superficial Englishman, it is to magnify my

own self-control. I could draw your secret out of you, if I liked, as I draw this finger out of the palm of my hand - you know I could! But you have appealed to my friendship, and the duties of friendship are sacred to me. See! I trample my base curiosity under my feet. My exalted sentiments lift me above it'" (351–52).

21. As John Kucich notes, "Sir Percival is not Laura's only deceitful husband" (91).

22. In *The Novel and the Police,* D. A. Miller argues that Walter's trip to Central America is needed to "stabilize his male self-mastery" so that he can be the appropriate "manly husband" for Laura (on 173, 166). Hartright's journey also neatly exemplifies the kind of "masculine plot" identified by Herbert Sussman in *Victorian Masculinities,* a plot in which time abroad is needed to learn the "practices and technologies of the self" required to control potentially disruptive male energy (on 10). Sussman's model of the masculine plot is most succinctly summarized on 47. In *The Power of Lies,* John Kucich ties these ideas of masculine self-mastery to practices of secrecy when he observes that one of the lessons Walter learns in the jungle is how to employ "stratagem" against his enemies (on 91).

23. During his return from Mr. Kyrle's office, Walter actually displays the lessons of colonialism in action when he acts to foil the pursuit of Sir Percival's agents: "I reached home on foot, taking the precaution, before I approached our own door, of walking round by the loneliest street in the neighborhood, and there stopping and looking back more than once over the open space behind me. I had first learnt to use this stratagem against suspected treachery in the wilds of Central America—and now I was practicing it again, with the same purpose and with even greater caution, in the heart of civilized London!" (474).

24. This strategy of using secrecy as a reluctant last resort calls to mind Steinmetz's comments in *The Novitiate* about England's distaste for its own necessary system of spies and informers, which he contrasts with the Jesuits' willing embrace of panoptical surveillance. Such a reference to the Jesuits would hardly be out of place in Collins's novel, since during his stay at Blackwater Park, Fosco even refers to himself as a Jesuit: "I am a Jesuit, if you please to think so—a splitter of straws—a man of trifles and crochets and scruples—but you will humour me, I hope, in merciful consideration for my suspicious Italian character, and my uneasy Italian conscience" (265). This evocation of Jesuitism is more complex than it at first appears, since it reverses the usual sense of the word in English by making it seem as if being "a splitter of straws" is a virtue rather than a sign of duplicity, and by connecting this rehabilitated definition to the Count's Italian nationality. At the same time that the Count articulates his Jesuitical scruples, however, Marian remains suspicious about "something in his manner of expressing of them" (265), suggesting that underneath this seemingly new aspect of virtuous secrecy there remains the same false spirit of Jesuitism. Since this Jesuitism remains connected to Fosco's declaration of national character and conscience, Italy, too, remains under suspicion as a result of Marian's misgivings.

25. For similar instances of questioning, see 503 and 514.

26. "Rome at the Close of 1867. Notes from Within the City" was written in the immediate aftermath of Garibaldi's failed attempt to seize the city and contains an account of the battle of

Mentana. An account of the battle of Mentana can also be found in "Garibaldi's Last Campaign." These articles were likely among Disraeli's sources for his version of the battle in *Lothair.*

27. On English hero-worship for Garibaldi, see "Italy and France" and Garibaldi's Invisible Bridge."

28. Rhetorical attacks on Napoleon III also appear in "Italy," "Italy and France," and "Rome at the Close of 1867. Notes from Within the City."

29. One example of the kind of general Anti-Papal sentiments articulated in English periodicals throughout the 1860s can be found in "Rome at the Close of 1867. Notes from Within the City." More specific accusations of Jesuitism were not wanting during this period either; for example, Edward Dicey, writing for *Macmillan's,* attributed many of Italy's present problems to the presence of the Jesuits.

30. For more on Italy and Ireland, see "Mr Thomas Trollope's Italian Novels" and "Italian Brigandage."

31. However, as one article correctly noted, the English were also violating the Act by supporting Garibaldi; for the author, this lawlessness and the duplicity that went along with it, made Italian unification an unattractive cause. See "Italy."

32. This continued suspicion of republicanism, and the principles of radical democracy on which it was based, can be seen even in articles otherwise friendly to unification; for example, one author for the *Edinburgh Review* wrote that, "For the decisions of Universal Sufferage, to which it is now the fashion for democrats and despots to pay equal homage, we can never affect to feel submission or respect; but this [the vote in Lombardy to join the Kingdom of Italy under Victor Emmanuel] was an instance in which, whatever had been the voting franchise, the result would have been the same" ("The Kingdom of Italy," 255).

33. Several pages later, the author alludes to a secret society known as the Camorra (on 584–85), a clandestine group of smugglers, gamblers, extortionists and murderers. More details on this organization are given in Heckethorn (I: 264–74).

34. Voicing a common complaint, the reviewer continued, "There is an unreality about even the best characters in the book which mars their life, and makes them little better than abstractions and dreams" ("Mr Disraeli's *Lothair,*" 85). The novel's strategies of characterization and the resulting sense of unreality were also attacked in the *North British Review,* which declared, "The future historian, if any were to rise, who should fancy that in *Lothair* he had discovered the key to the characters of the actors of these days, will have fallen under the spell of some mischievous goblin, who has feigned a false resurrection scene for his bewilderment" ("Lothair," 454).

35. The same review also dismisses Lothair as "a passive instrument" and "a mere puppet" of the Anglicans and Roman Catholics vying for his fortune and decries the lack of difference between these two groups of religious conspirators (on 142, 156). Even otherwise friendly reviewers were forced to admit that the novel was something of a "fairy tale" ("Disraeli's *Lothair,*" 278), in part because of its portrayal of European secret societies. The writer for the *Edinburgh Review* found it necessary to excuse Disraeli's "thoroughly extravagant and, as we believe, entirely false in fact" representation of secret societies as "hardly condemnatory" ("Disraeli's *Lothair,*" 286). Others were less forgiving, finding "his revelations about the secret societies, Mary-Anne and Madre Natura

. . . worthy of the unsuspicious credulity of an Abbé Barruel" ("Lothair," *North British Review,* 462). For more on the critical history of *Lothair,* see R. W. Stewart's *Disraeli's Novels Reviewed.*

36. The novel's original publication and reception history can be found in Braun, 4–7, 130–32. Its contemporary success is also detailed on 3–7 of J. M. Roberts, who writes, "The best reason for paying attention to [Disraeli's views as expressed in *Lothair*] here lies not in the possible effect on his behaviour but in the acceptability he felt they would command. Such ideas [of secret societies] were the common intellectual furniture of the minds of his contemporaries; this is why they provided a good focus for his novel. For once, Disraeli is significant as a typical rather than an eccentric figure. His words expressed a widely held mythology and *Lothair,* the novel from which they were taken, became, almost at once, a best-seller in both England and the United States" (4).

37. A similarly brief summary is also available in Schwarz, 129–30. More lengthy summaries accompanied nearly all of the novel's nineteenth-century reviews; the summary featured in *Blackwood's* is particularly detailed (and caustic).

38. For more on the historical basis for Lothair, see Braun, 132 and the *Edinburgh Review* article, "Disraeli's *Lothair.*"

39. Like Lothair, Grandison is also based on a real person, the controversial Cardinal Manning, with whom Disraeli had had a political falling out shortly before beginning the novel. See Schwarz, 127–28.

40. Richard Levine points out the centrality of these three female figures during his brief but insightful reading of the novel in *Benjamin Disraeli,* 136–44.

41. The reader is allowed into a secret meeting of the Standing Committee in Chapter XI, where it is revealed that they are a kind of transnational revolutionary organization on the order of the Carbonari, on 55–58.

42. A related memory of past risings actually convinces the General, now known as Captain Bruges, to lead that contingent of Italian revolutionaries of which Lothair is a part: "It was only toward the end of the preceding month that he had resolved to take the field; but the organization of the secret societies is so complete that he knew he could always almost instantly secure the assembling of a picked force in a particular place" (252–53).

43. This is not to say that the connection between the figure of the secret society and the issue of political representation was entirely severed in the years following the publication of *Lothair;* rather, even when constituencies pressing for more equitable representation were accused of being secret societies, they were associated with foreignness. In the years leading up to WWI, for example, various working-class groups, including trade unions, were denounced as French-inspired Communists or German-inspired Socialists; political radicals became Anarchists, a group made anathema both by its Russian roots and by several successful political assassinations carried out by anarchists in Russia, Italy and the United States; Ritualists within the Anglican Church continued to be accused of Papal-inspired Jesuitism after Walter Walsh's denunciatory *The Secret History of the Oxford Movement* (1898); Indian nationalists remained subject to associations with the Mutiny and the figure of Thuggee;

and even nonviolent supporters of Irish independence were stigmatized as Fenians, and, during the war, as German sympathizers. At the same time, practices of secrecy still remained attractive to the elite public, especially when connected to the expansion and preservation of the British Empire. In this more imperial vein, although in his final will he did devote much of his wealth to establishing the now-famous Rhodes Scholars program, Cecil Rhodes, in the many earlier drafts, designated increasingly large sums to the creation of a secret society "on the Jesuit model" dedicated to bringing the world under British control. For more on Rhodes's early wills, see John Marlowe's *Cecil Rhodes,* especially 210–11; and Robert Rotberg's *The Founder,* 100–102, 234–35.

44. By the 1880s Disraeli's rather chaotic mix of foreign conspirators would be disciplined into a new subgenre of British fiction, the spy novel. According to David Stafford, whose "Spies and Gentlemen" provides an excellent introduction to this new genre, early British spy novels sought to resolve the "apparent contradiction between the activities of the international spy and the calling of an English gentleman" through precisely the same formal mechanism that those who invoked the figure of the secret society attempted to differentiate between, for example, Roman Catholicism and English Protestantism: the "contradiction was largely resolved through the attribution of all the negative connotations of espionage to the figure of the foreign spy. It quickly became established as a convention of the genre that there was a clear distinction between spies, who were foreign, and secret agents, who were British" (491).

45. We can see this potential association between secrecy and domesticity growing stronger in each succeeding literary text discussed in this book. In *Sartor Resartus,* it may be the swallows that practice "the mason-craft," but it is important to note that they do so in the protected space provided for them by the head of Teufelsdröckh's own domestic world, his father. In addition, Carlyle's supposed autobiography constantly plays at both secreting and revealing the details of private life, entering, for example, into Teufelsdröckh's failed intimacy with Blumine while clothing that intimacy in such abstract symbolic garments that the particulars remain carefully veiled (II.5). In *Barnaby Rudge* Dickens does not simply oppose the 'Prentice Knights and the Varden family, or the Protestant Association and the Haredales; instead, he roots each secretive organization in the frustrated desires of the domestic sphere and resolves the public unrest caused by these societies in the privacy of marriage. *Sybil* similarly links secrecy and domesticity by using a marriage to end the Plug Riots, even as the novel suggests by ironic juxtaposition that working-class men like Dandy Mick may be forced into combination not just by the exploitative truck system but also by the breakdown of domestic ties caused by female and child labor in the nation's coal mines. The novels of Collins are even more insistent about the link between secrecy and domesticity. Not only do the Verinders close ranks to stifle Sergeant Cuff's investigation into the family's dirty laundry, both literal and figurative, in *The Moonstone,* but *The Woman in White* revolves around the practices of licit (Walter) and illicit (Percival) secrecy in the marriages of Laura Fairlie.

46. Tosh highlights the growing importance of "home," as a private space distinct from the public realm of commerce, in Victorian constructions of virtuous masculinity; he then tracks changes in the construction of "home," many of which led to the home—and any man in it—being sub-

ject to feminine authority, and how those changes challenged Victorian men to preserve their manliness. According to the logic of Tosh's argument, one way to remain "a man" while escaping the moral pollution of commerce would be to form a private association exclusively made up of men, thereby bracketing off a home-like space that remained unproblematically manly. Those middle-class Victorian men who joined the Freemasons, the X-Club, the Royal Society, or any of the other numerous male social and professional clubs especially available in the last third of the century in the metropolis, did so, at least in part, to indicate their manliness and their virtue. They then protected this newly won territory through the practices of secrecy to which such organizations bound their members.

Figuratively related to the Masons and other groups cited above, but rendered less unambiguously acceptable to late-Victorian men by their association with femininity, were the large number of more esoteric societies that flourished in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As Janet Oppenheimer observes in *The other world: Spiritualism and psychical research in England,* the final thirty-year period of Victoria's reign was an "age of 'Esoteric Buddhism,' of the Rosicrucian revival, of cabalists, Hermeticists, and reincarnationists" (160). Groups like Helena Petrova Blavatsky's Theosophical Society, Robert Wentworth Little's Rosicrucian Society, and Dr. William Wynn Westcott and Samuel Liddell MacGregor's Hermetic Order of the Golden Dawn used the allures of secrecy and occult knowledge to attract many members of Britain's privileged classes, the most well known of which is probably William Butler Yeats. For information on these organizations beyond that found in Oppenheimer, see Brantlinger, *Rule of Darkness,* 227–53; Mackenzie, 130–46; Heckethorne, 219–30; and Ellic Howe's *The Magicians of the Golden Dawn*.

Bibliography

An Act for the Relief of His Majesty's Roman Catholic Subjects (13 April 1829). *Parliamentary Papers. Statutes at Large.* 10 George IV, cap. 7.

Adams, James Eli. *Dandies and Desert Saints: Styles of Victorian Manhood.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Albrecht-Carrié, René. *Italy from Napoleon to Mussolini.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1950.

Altick, Richard. *The Presence of the Present: Topics of the Day in Victorian Fiction.* Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1991.

"The Anglo-Catholic Theory." *Edinburgh Review* 94, no. 192 (October 1851): 527–57.

"An Anglo-Indian Lament for John Company." *Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country* 57, no. 341 (May 1858): 635–42.

The Annual Register: A Review of Public Events at Home and Abroad, For the Year 1871. New Series. London: Rivington, 1872.

The Annual Register, or A View of the History and Politics for the Year 1829. London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1830.

The Annual Register, or A View of the History and Politics for the Year 1838. London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1839.

The Annual Register, or A View of the History and Politics for the Year 1850. London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1851.

The Annual Register, or A View of the History and Politics for the Year 1851. London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1852.

The Annual Register, or A View of the History and Politics for the Year 1857. London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1858.

The Annual Register, or A View of the History and Politics for the Year 1858. London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1859.

The Annual Register, or A View of the History and Politics for the Year 1859. London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1860.

[Arnold, Thomas]. "The Oxford Malignants and Dr. Hampden." *Edinburgh Review* 63 (April–July 1836): 225–39.

Arnstein, Walter L. *Protestant versus Catholic in Mid-Victorian England: Mr. Newdegate and the Nuns.* Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1982.

Attridge, Steve. "Echoes of Empire III: Dis-Orientated Fiction." *Encounter* 66, no. 2 (February 1986): 60–70.

"Austria, France, and Italy." *Edinburgh Review* 109, no. 222 (April 1859): 558–97.

"Austria." *All the Year Round* 1 (18 June 1859): 173–77.

"Austrian Italy." *Bentley's Quarterly Review* 1, no. 1 (March 1859): 301–41.

Baernreither, J. M. *English Associations of Working Men.* Trans. Alice Taylor. English edition. London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1899. [republished in 1966 by Gale Research Company, Detroit].

Bagehot, William. *The English Constitution.* London: Chapman and Hall, 1867.

Baker, Lee C. R. "The Old Clothesman Transformed: Thomas Carlyle's Radical Vision." *VIJ: Victorians Institute Journal* 11 (1982–1983): 45–51.

———. "The Open Secret of *Sartor Resartus:* Carlyle's Method of Converting His Reader." *Studies in Philology* 83, no. 2 (Spring 1986): 218–35.

Baldridge, Cates. "Alternatives to Bourgeois Individualism in *A Tale of Two Cities.*" *SEL: Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 30, no. 4 (Autumn 1990): 633–54.

Balée, Susan. "Wilkie Collins and Surplus Women: The Case of Marian Halcombe." *Victorian Literature and Culture* 20 (1992): 197–215.

Barker, Philip. *Michel Foucault: Subversions of the Subject.* New York: St. Martin's, 1993.

[Barrett, Joseph H.]. *American Whig Review* 14 (February 1849): 121–34.

Barruel, Abbé. *Memoires, Illustrating the History of Jacobitism.* Trans. Robert Clifford. London, 1797.

"The Battle of the Churches." *Westminster Review* 54, no. 2 (January 1851): 441–96.

[Beard, J. R.]. "March Gales and the Government." *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine* new series 18.208 (April 1851): 249–52.

———. "Parliamentary Session of 1851." *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine* new series 18, no. 213 (September 1851): 517–25.

———. "What Is It All About?" *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine* new series 18.205 (January 1851): 43–52.

Becker, Bernard H. *Scientific London.* New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1875.

"The Bengal Mutiny," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 82, no. 503 (September 1857): 372–92.

Biernard, Charles A. "Rebelling from the Right Siade: Thomas Carlyle's Struggle against the Dominant Nineteenth-Century Rhetoric." *Studies in Scottish Literature* 22 (1987): 142–56.

Bloom, Abigail Burnham. "Transcendence through Incongruity: The Background of Humor in Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus.*" In *The Victorian Comic Spirit: New Perspectives,* edited by Jennifer A. Wagner-Lawlor, 153–72. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000.

Bok, Sissela. *Secrets: On the Ethics of Concealment and Revelation.* New York: Pantheon, 1982.

Brantlinger, Patrick. "The Case Against Trade Unions in Early Victorian Fiction." *Victorian Studies* 13 (1969): 37–52.

———. "Tory-Radicalism and 'The Two Nations' in Disraeli's *Sybil.*" *Victorian Newsletter* 41 (1972): 13–17.

———. "'Romance,' 'Biography,' and the Making of *Sartor Resartus.*" *Philological Quarterly* 52, no. 1 (January 1973): 108–18.

———. *Rule of Darkness: British Literature and Imperialism, 1830–1914.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1988.

———. *The Spirit of Reform.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1977.

Braun, Thom. *Disraeli the Novelist.* New York: Allen & Unwin, 1981.

"The 'Breaking in Upon the Constitution of 1688.'" *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 25, no. 151 (April 1829): 503–24.

"Brief Remarks on a Late Long Debate in the House of Commons." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 24, no. 141 (July 1828): 87–94.

Brookes, Gerry H. *The Rhetorical Form of Carlyle's* Sartor Resartus. Berkeley : University of California Press, 1972.

Bueler, Lois E. "Disraeli's *Sybil* and Holinshed's *Chronicles.*" *Victorian Newsletter* 54 (Fall 1978): 17–19.

Burgan, William M. "Masonic Symbolism in *The Moonstone* and *The Mystery of Edwin Drood.*" *Dickens Studies Annual: Essays on Victorian Fiction* 16 (1987): 257–303.

Butt, John, and Kathleen Tillotson. *Dickens at Work.* London: Methuen, 1957.

"The Campaign in Italy." *Bentley's Quarterly Review* 1, no. 2 (July 1859): 629–54.

Carlyle, Thomas. *On Heroes, Hero-Worship, & the Heroic in History* (1841). Edited by Michael K. Goldberg. Strouse Edition. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

———. *Sartor Resartus: the Life and Opinions of Herr Teufelsdröckh in Three Books* (1833–34). Edited by Roger L. Tarr. Strouse Edition. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

———. "Signs of the Times." *Edinburgh Review* 49, no. 98 (June 1829): 439–59.

———. *The Works of Thomas Carlyle in Thirty Volumes.* Edited by H. D. Traill. Centenary Edition. New York: Scribner, 1896–1901.

"Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus.*" *Southern Literary Journal* 1, no.1 new series (March 1837): 1–8.

Carter, Nick. "Rethinking Cavour." *Modern History Review* 9, no. 2 (Winter 1997): 10–13.

Cartwright, W. C. "The Policy of Italy." *The Fortnightly Review* 5, no.30 (1 August 1866): 641–53.

Case, Alison. "Against Scott: The Antihistory of Dickens's *Barnaby Rudge.*" *CLIO: A Journal of Literature, History, and the Philosophy of History* 19, no. 2 (Winter 1990): 127–45.

"The Catholic Question." *Westminster Review* 10, no. 19 (January 1829): 1–36.

"Catholicism, a Conservative Principle." *Dublin Review* 29, no. 58 (December 1850): 416–32.

Church, R. W. *The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years 1833–45.* London: Macmillan, 1904.

Clough, Shepard B., and Salvatore Saladino. *A History of Modern Italy: Documents, Readings, & Commentary.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1968.

Clubbe, John. "John Carlyle in Germany and the Genesis of *Sartor Resartus.*" In *Romantic and Victorian: Studies in Memory of William H. Marshall,* edited by W. Paul Elledge and Richard L. Hoffman, 264–89. Rutherford, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickenson University Press, 1971.

Cockshut, A. O. J. "The Literary and Historical Significance of the *Present Position of Catholics.*" In *Newman After a Hundred Years,* edited by Ian Ker and Alan G. Hill. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Collins, Wilkie. *The Moonstone* (1868). Edited by Anthea Trodd. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.

———. *The Woman in White* (1860). Edited by Julian Symons. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985.

"The Company's Raj." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 82, no. 505 (November 1857): 615–42.

Connor, Steven. "Space, Place and the Body of Riot in *Barnaby Rudge*." In *Charles Dickens,* edited by Steven Connor, 211–29. London: Longman, 1996.

Conrad, Joseph. *The Secret Agent: A Simple Tale* (1906). Edited by Roger Tennant. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Cousins, Mark and Athar Hussein. *Michel Foucault.* London: Macmillan, 1984.

Cowlishaw, Brian. "The Cultural Revolution of *Sartor Resartus.*" *Carlyle Studies Annual* 16 (1996): 51–60.

Crawford, Iain. "'Nature . . . Drenched in Blood': *Barnaby Rudge* and Wordsworth's 'The Idiot Boy.'" *Dickens Quarterly* 8, no. 1 (March 1991): 38–47.

"Crisis of the Sepoy Rebellion." *The London Quarterly Review* 9, no. 18 (January 1858): 530–70.

Cvetkovich, Ann. "Ghostlier Determinations: The Economy of Sensation and *The Woman in White*." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 23, no. 1 (Fall 1989): 24–43.

Dahl, Robert. *Democracy and Its Critics.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1989.

[Dallas, E. S.]. "Popular Literature—The Periodical Press." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 85, no. 519 (January 1859): 96–112.

Davis, Dale W. "Symbolizing the Supernatural in Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus.*" *University of Mississippi Studies in English* 8 (1990): 92–96.

Davis, John A. "Reading History: Italian Unification." *History Today* 34 (November 1984): 43–46.

"The Day of Humiliation." *Bentley's Miscellany* 42 (November 1857): 458–66.

De Quincey, Thomas. "Historico-Critical Inquiry Into the Origin of the Rosicrucians and Free-Masons" (1824). In *The Collected Writings of Thomas De Quincey.* New and Enlarged Edition. Edited by David Masson, 14 vols. Vol. XIII, 384–448. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1890.

———. "Secret Societies" (1847). *The Collected Writings of Thomas De Quincey.* Edited by David Mason 173–229. New and enlarged edition. 14 vols. Vol. VII. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1890.

Dean, Jodi. "Declarations of Independence." In *Cultural Studies & Political Theory,* edited by Dean, 285–304. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2000.

Deen, Leonard W. "Irrational Form in *Sartor Resartus.*" *Texas Studies in Literature and Language: A Journal of the Humanities* 5 (1963): 438–51.

DeLaura, David. *Hebrew and Hellene in Victorian England: Newman, Arnold, and Pater.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1969.

Deneau, Daniel P. "Relationship of Style and Device in *Sartor Resartus.*" *Victorian Newsletter* 17 (Spring 1960): 17–20.

Di Leo, Jeffrey R. "The Clothing of Truth: Reflections on Carlyle's Theory of the Symbol." In *Semiotics 1993,* edited by Robert S. Corrington and John Deely, 381–90. New York: Peter Lang, 1995.

Dibble, Jerry A. *The Pythia's Drunken Song: Thomas Carlyle's* Sartor Resartus *and the Style Problem in German Idealist Philosophy.* The Hague: Nijhoff, 1978.

Dicey, Edward. "The Passaglia Phase of the Papal Question." *Macmillan's Magazine* 5, no. 26 (December 1861): 168–76.

Dickens, Charles. *Barnaby Rudge* (1841). Ed. Gordon Spence. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1997.

———. *Bleak House* (1852–53). Edited by Norman Page. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985.

———. *David Copperfield* (1849–1850). Edited by Nina Burgis. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

———. *Letters.* Edited by Walter Dexter. 3 vols. Bloomsbury: Nonesuch Press, 1937–38.

———. *Little Dorrit* (1855–57). Edited by John Holloway. Baltimore: Penguin, 1967.

———. "The Perils of Certain English Prisoners" (1857). In *The Works of Charles Dickens,* 207–70. National Library Edition. 20 vols. Vol. 13. New York: Bigelow, Brown and Co., 1921.

Dinwiddy, John. "Luddism and Politics in the Northern Counties." *Social History* 4 (1979): 33–63.

Disraeli, Benjamin. *Lothair* (1870). *The Novels of Benjamin Disraeli.* vol. 10. New York: P. F. Collier & Son, 1853–1880.

———. *Sybil, or, The Two Nations* (1845). Edited by Sheila M. Smith. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

"Disraeli's *Lothair.*" *Edinburgh Review* 132, no. 269 (July 1870): 275–89.

Duff, Rev. Alexander. *The Indian Mutiny; Its Causes and Results. In a Series of Letters.* 2d ed. London: James Nisbet and Co., 1858.

Dyson, A. E. *The Inimitable Dickens: A Reading of the Novels.* New York: Macmillan, 1970.

Eliot, George [Mary Ann Evans]. *Daniel Deronda* (1876). Edited by Graham Handley. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.

———. "Thomas Carlyle" (1855), 187–92. In *Selected Critical Writings.* Edited by Rosemary Ashton. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Embree, Ainslie T., ed. *1857 in India: Mutiny or War of Independence?* Boston: D. C. Heath, 1963.

Engels, Frederick. *The Condition of the Working-Class in England in 1844, with Preface Written in 1892.* Trans. Florence Kelley Wischnewetzky. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1892.

"The English in India." *Westminster Review* 69, no. 135 o. s., 13, no. 1 n. s. (January 1858): 180–209.

Epstein, James A. *Radical Expression: Political Language, Ritual, and Symbol in England 1790–1850.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Evans, B. *Modern Popery: A Series of Letters on Some of Its More Important Aspects.* Leeds and London: J. Heaton & Son and Houlston & Stoneman, 1855.

[Everett, Alexander H.]. "Thomas Carlyle." *North American Review* 41 (October 1835): 454–82.

"A Familiar Epistle from Mr John Company to Mr John Bull." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 83, no. 508 (February 1858): 245–58.

Fido, Martin. "'From His Own Observation': Sources of Working Class Passages in Disraeli's *Sybil.*" *Modern Language Review* 72 (1977): 268–84.

Findlay, L. M. "Paul de Man, Thomas Carlyle, and 'The Rhetoric of Temporality.'" *Dalhousie Review* 65, no. 2 (Summer 1985): 159–81.

Flindall, R. P., ed. *The Church of England 1815–1948: A Documentary History.* London: SPCK, 1972.

Folland, Harold F. "The Doer and the Deed: Theme and Pattern in *Barnaby Rudge*." *PMLA* 74 (1959): 406–17.

"Foreign Affairs—War in Italy." *Quarterly Review* 105, no. 210 (April 1859): 527–64.

"Foreign Views of the Catholic Question," *Foreign Quarterly Review* 4, no. 7 (April 1829): 275–306.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (1975). Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage, 1977.

———. *The History of Sexuality. Volume I: An Introduction* (1976). Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage, 1990.

"France and Central Italy." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 87, no. 532 (February 1860): 245–54.

Franklin, Stephen L. "The Editor as Reconstructor: Carlyle's Historical View as a Shaping Force in the Fiction of *Sartor Resartus*." *Ball State University Forum* 18, no. 3 (1977): 32–39.

Friedberg, Joan B. "Alienation and Integration in *Barnaby Rudge*." *Dickens Studies Newsletter* 11 (1980): 11–15.

Gallagher, Catherine. *The Industrial Reformation of English Fiction: Social Discourse and Narrative Form 1832–67.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

"Garibaldi and the Italian Volunteers." *Westminster Review* American Edition 72, no. 142 (October 1859): 266–80.

"Garibaldi's Invisible Bridge." *Cornhill Magazine* 9, no. 53 (May 1864): 537–54.

"Garibaldi's Last Campaign." *Cornhill Magazine* 17, no. 97 (January 1868): 111–28.

Giddings, Robert, ed. *The Changing World of Charles Dickens.* London; Totowa, N.J.: Vision; Barnes & Noble, 1983.

Gilley, Sheridan. "Roman Catholicism." In *Nineteenth-Century English Religious Traditions: Retrospect and Prospect,* edited by D. G. Paz, 33–56. Westport and London: Greenwood, 1995.

"The Government of India and the Mutinies." *The British Quarterly Review* 26, no. 52 (October 1857): 476–504.

"The Grand Mosque and Imperial Palace of Delhi." *Bentley's Miscellany* 42 (November 1857): 546–50.

[Greg, W. R.]. "Representative Reform." *Edinburgh Review* 96, no. 196 (October 1852): 452–508.

[Gregg, Hilda]. "The Indian Mutiny in English Fiction." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 161, no. 976 (February 1897): 218–31.

Gruner, Elisabeth Rose. "Family Secrets and the Mysteries of the Moonstone." *Victorian Literature and Culture* 21 (1993): 127–45.

Hadley, Elaine. *Melodramatic Tactics: Theatricalized Dissent in the English Marketplace, 1800–1885.* Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1995.

Haney, Janice L. "'Shadow-Hunting': Romantic Irony, *Sartor Resartus,* and Victorian Romanticism." *Studies in Romanticism* 17, no. 3 (Summer 1978): 307–33.

Hansard's Parliamentary Debates. Third series. London: Thomas Curson Hansard et al.

Hayter, Alethea. *Opium and the Romantic Imagination.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.

Heckethorn, Charles William. *The Secret Societies of All Ages and Countries.* 2 vols. New York: University Books, 1965 [reprint of 1897 second edition].

Hennelly, Mark M., Jr. "Detecting Collins' Diamond: From Serpentstone to Moonstone." *Nineteenth Century Literature* 39, no. 1 (June 1984): 25–47.

"The Hierarchy." *Dublin Review* 29, no. 58 (December 1850): 507–35 and 30, no. 59 (March 1851): 176–207.

Hinde, Wendy. *Catholic Emancipation: A Shake to Men's Minds.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.

Hobsbawm, Eric, and George Rudé. *Captain Swing.* Rpt. London: Phoenix Press, 2001

Holmes, Derek. *More Roman than Rome: English Catholicism in the Nineteenth Century.* London and Shepherdstown: Burns & Oates and Patmos Press, 1978.

Holt, Edgar. *Risorgimento: The Making of Italy 1815–1870.* London: Macmillan, 1970.

"How Is India to be Governed?" *Bentley's Miscellany* 43 (February 1858): 111–23.

Howe, Ellic. *The Magicians of the Golden Dawn: A Documentary History of the Magical Order 1887–1923.* London: Routledge, 1972.

Hyder, Clyde K. "Wilkie Collins and *The Woman in White*." *PMLA* 54 (1939): 297–303.

"India as it is—India as it may be." *The British Quarterly Review* 27, no. 53 (January 1858): 202–44.

"Indian Heroes." *Westminster Review* 70, no. 138 o. s., 14, no. 2 n. s. (October 1858): 350–75.

"The Indian Mutinies." *Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country* 56, no. 332 (August 1857): 238–41.

"The Indian Mutinies." *Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country* 56, no. 335 (November 1857): 627–30.

"Ireland, and the Catholic Question." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 24, no. 144 (October 1828): 409–440.

"Italian Brigandage." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 93, no. 571 (May 1863): 576–85.

"The Italian Campaign of 1859." *Edinburgh Review* 110, no. 224 (October 1859): 454–94.

"The Italian Question." *Westminster Review* American Edition 71, no. 140 (April 1869): 244–69.

"Italy." *Quarterly Review* 109, no. 217 (January 1861): 133–77.

"Italy and France." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 92, no. 564 (October 1862): 503–26.

"Italy: Her Nationality or Dependence." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 85, no. 521 (March 1859): 350–65.

Jackson, Thomas A. *Charles Dickens: The Progress of a Radical.* London: Lawrence and Wisehart, 1937.

Janssen, Winnifred. "The Science of Things in General: Method or Madness?" *Dutch Quarterly Review* 7, no. 1 (1977): 23–44.

Kaye, Sir John William. *A History of the Sepoy War in India, 1857–1858.* 2d ed. 3 vols. London: W. H. Allen, 1865–76.

Kerr, Donal A. *Peel, Priests, and Politics: Sir Robert Peel's Administration and the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, 1841–1846.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

"The Kingdom of Italy." *Edinburgh Review* 113, no. 229 (January 1861): 253–82.

Knight, Peter. *Conspiracy Culture: From the Kennedy Assassination to* The X Files. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.

Knoepflmacher, U. C. "The Counterworld of Victorian Fiction and *The Woman in White*." In *The Worlds of Victorian Fiction,* edited by Jerome H. Buckley, 351–69. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Kucich, John. *The Power of Lies: Transgression in Victorian Fiction.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1994.

"The Last of the Catholic Question—Its Principles, History, and Effects." *Edinburgh Review* 49, no. 97 (March 1829): 218–72.

Leavy, Barbara Fass. "Wilkie Collins' Cinderella: The History of Psychology and *The Woman in White*." *Dickens Studies Annual: Essays on Victorian Fiction* 10 (1982): 91–141.

Levine, George. "*Sartor Resartus* and the Balance of Fiction." *Victorian Studies: A Journal of the Humanities, Arts and Sciences* 8, no. 2 (December 1964): 131–60.

Levine, Richard A. *Benjamin Disraeli.* New York: Twayne, 1968.

Lindberg, John. "The Artistic Unity of *Sartor Resartus*." *Victorian Newsletter* 17 (Spring 1960): 20–23.

Lively, Jack, and John Rees, eds. *Utilitarian Logic and Politics: James Mill's 'Essay on Government,' Macaulay's Critique and the Ensuing Debate.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.

Lonoff, Sue. *Wilkie Collins and His Victorian Readers: A Study in the Rhetoric of Authorship.* New York: AMS Press, 1982.

"Lothair." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 107, no. 656 (June 1870): 773–93.

"Lothair." *Macmillan's Magazine* 22, no. 128 (June 1870): 142–60.

"Lothair." *North British Review* 52, no. 104 (July 1870): 453–73.

Lovett, Clara M. *The Democratic Movement in Italy 1830–1876.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Lovett, William. *Life and Struggles of William Lovett.* Fitzroy Edition. London: Macgibbon & Kee, 1967 [reprint of 1876 London edition].

Lummis, C. Douglas. *Radical Democracy.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Lushington, Franklin. "The Crisis of Italian Freedom." *Macmillan's Magazine* 1, no. 1 (November 1859): 55–63.

Lyon, Janet. *Manifestoes: Provocations of the Modern.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1999.

Macaulay, Lord Thomas. *History of England* (1848–61). *The Complete Works of Lord Macaulay.* Albany edition. 12 vols. Vols. I–IV. London: Longman's, Green and Co., 1898.

[————]. "Mill's Essay on Government." *Edinburgh Review* 49, no. 97 (March 1829): 159–89.

MacDonagh, Gwendolyn. "'Fill Up All the Gaps': Narrative and Illegitimacy in *The Woman in White*." *Journal of Narrative Technique* 26, no. 3 (Fall 1996): 274–91.

MacKenzie, Norman, ed. *Secret Societies.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Mack Smith, Dennis. "The Unification of Italy: Some Myths Re-examined." *Modern History Review* 1, no. 1 (Fall 1989): 8–11.

Magnet, Myron James. *Dickens and the Social Order.* Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1985.

Majeed, Joved. "Meadows Taylor's *Confessions of a Thug:* The Anglo-Indian Novel as a Genre in the Making." In *Writing India 1757–1990: The Literature of British India,* edited by Bart Moore-Gilbert, 86–110. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996.

Majumdar, R. C. *The Sepoy Mutiny and the Revolt of 1857.* 2d ed. Calcutta: Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 1963.

Malleson, Colonel G. B. *History of the Indian Mutiny, 1857–58. Commencing from the Close of the Second Volume of Sir John Kaye's* History of the Sepoy War. 2d ed. 3 vols. London: W. H. Allen, 1878–80.

———. *The Indian Mutiny of 1857.* Delhi: Dutta Book Centre, 1977 [reprint of 1891 edition].

Marcus, David D. "The Carlylean Vision of *A Tale of Two Cities.*" *Studies in the Novel* 8 (1976): 56–68.

Marcus, Steven. *Dickens: From Pickwick to Dombey.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1965.

Marlow, John. *Cecil Rhodes: The Anatomy of Empire.* London: Paul Elek, 1972.

Maurice, C. E. "Life and Writings of Joseph Mazzini: Translated.—Vols. I. II. III." *Macmillan's Magazine* 16, no. 91 (May 1867): 54–61.

McIntire, C. T. *England Against the Papacy, 1858–61: Tories, Liberals, and the Overthrow of Papal Temporal Power during the Italian Risorgimento.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Mehta, Jaya. "English Romance: Indian Violence." *The Centennial Review* 34, no. 3 (Fall 1995): 537–58.

Metcalf, Thomas R. *The Aftermath of Revolt: India 1857–1870.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1964.

Michasiw, Kim Ian. "*Barnaby Rudge:* The Since of the Fathers." *ELH* 56, no. 3 (Fall 1989): 571–92.

Mill, John Stuart. *Considerations on Representative Government.* 2d ed. London: Parker, Son and Bourn, 1861.

———. *Essays on Politics and Culture.* Edited by Gertrude Himmelfarb. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1962.

Miller, D. A. *The Novel and the Police.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Miller, J. Hillis. "'Hieroglyphical Truth' in *Sartor Resartus:* Carlyle and the Language of Parable." In *Victorian Perspectives: Six Essays,* edited by John Clubbe and Jerome Meckier, 1–20. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1989.

Mills, William C. "Unity Deferred: The 'Roman Question' in Italian History, 1861–82." *Past Imperfect* 4 (1995): 31–55.

Mouffe, Chantal, ed. *Dimensions of Radical Democracy: Pluralism, Citizenship, Community.* London: Verso, 1992.

"Mr Thomas Trollope's Italian Novels." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 93, no. 567 (January 1863): 84–98.

"Mr. Disraeli's *Lothair.*" *Quarterly Review* 129, no. 257 (July 1870): 63–87.

Nadel, Ira Bruce. "Science and *The Moonstone.*" *Dickens Studies Annual: Essays on Victorian Fiction* 11 (1983): 239–59.

"Napoleonism and Italy." *North British Review* 31, no. 61 (August 1859): 243–68.

Nayder, Lillian. "Agents of Empire in *The Woman in White.*" *Victorian Newsletter* 83 (Spring 1993): 1–7.

———. "Class Consciousness and the Indian Mutiny in Dickens's 'The Perils of Certain English Prisoners.'" *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 32, no. 4 (Summer 1992): 689–705.

———. *Wilkie Collins.* New York: Twayne, 1997.

"The Neapolitan and Roman Question." *Westminster Review* American Edition 75, no. 147 (June 1861): 59–80.

[Newdegate, Charles]. *A Glimpse of the Great Secret Society* (1868). 3d ed. London: William Macintosh, 1872.

Newman, John Henry, Cardinal. *Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England* (1851). London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1899.

Newman, S. J. "*Barnaby Rudge:* Dickens and Scott." In *Literature of the Romantic Period, 1750–1850,* edited by R. T. Davies and Bernard G. Beatty, 171–88. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1976.

"Newman's *History of the Arians.*" *Edinburgh Review* 63, no. 127 (April 1836): 44–72.

Nockles, Peter Benedict. *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760–1857.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Nord, Deborah Epstein. "The Social Explorer as Anthropologist: Victorian Travelers Among the Urban Poor." In *Visions of the Modern City: Essays in History, Art, and Literature,* edited by William Sharpe and Leonard Wallock, 118–30. New York: Proceedings of the Haymond Center for the Humanities at Columbia University, 1984.

Norman, Edward R. *Anti-Catholicism in Victorian England.* New York: Barnes, 1968.

———. *The English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.

———. *Roman Catholicism in England from the Elizabethan Settlement to the Second Vatican Council.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

"North-Italian Character." *All the Year Round* 1 (10 September 1859): 461–67.

O'Kell, Robert. "Two Nations, or One? Disraeli's Allegorical Romance." *Victorian Studies: A Journal of the Humanities, Arts and Sciences* 30, no. 2 (Winter 1987): 211–34.

Oppenheimer, Janet. *The Other World: Spiritualism and Psychical Research in England, 1850–1914.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

"The Organization of Italy." *Westminster Review* American Edition 74, no. 146 (October 1860): 206–19.

"Oude and the Defence of Lucknow." *Bentley's Miscellany* 43 (April 1858): 414–24.

"Our Indian Empire." *Bentley's Miscellany* 42 (September 1857): 258–65.

"Our Indian Empire." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 82, no. 506 (December 1857): 643–64.

"Our Relation to the Princes of India." *Westminster Review* 69, no. 136 o. s. 13, no. 2 n. s. (April 1858): 453–77.

"Oxford and Doctor Hampden." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 39, no. 246 (April 1836): 425–34.

"The Papal Aggression Bill." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 69, no. 427 (May 1851): 573–87.

"The Papal Government." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 88, no. 540 (October 1860): 396–407.

"Papers on the Italian Question." *North British Review* 31, no. 62 (November 1859): 530–46.

Pastoral Appeal from his Holiness the Pope to some Members of the University of Oxford. 3d ed. London: B. Fellows, 1836.

Paxton, Nancy L. "Mobilizing Chivalry: Rape in British Novels about the Indian Uprising of 1857." *Victorian Studies* 36, no. 1 (Fall 1992): 5–30.

Paz, D. G. *Popular Anti-Catholicism in Mid-Victorian England.* Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1992.

Pelling, Henry. *A History of British Trade Unionism.* 5th ed. London: Macmillan, 1992.

Perkins, Pamela and Mary Donaghy. "A Man's Resolution: Narrative Strategies in Wilkie Collins' *The Woman in White*." *Studies in the Novel* 22, no. 4 (Winter 1990): 392–402.

"The Philosophy of Catholicism." *Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country* 1, no. 1 (February 1830): 17–24.

Pick, Fred L. and Norman Knight. *The Pocket History of Freemasonry.* 8th ed. Revised by Frederick Smythe. New York: Muller, 1991.

Pickering, Sam. "*Sartor Resartus,* Thomas Carlyle, and the Novel." *Research Studies* 44 (1976): 208–16.

Pickering, W. S. F. *Anglo-Catholicism: A Study in Religious Ambiguity.* London and New York: Routledge, 1989.

"Piedmont." *All the Year Round* 1 (16 July 1859): 269–74.

Plotz, John. "Crowd Power: Chartism, Carlyle, and the Victorian Public Sphere." *Representations* 70 (Spring 2000): 87–114.

"The Poorbeah Mutiny—The Punjab." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 83, no. 507 (January 1858): 94–101.

Poovey, Mary. *Uneven Developments: The Ideological Work of Gender in Mid-Victorian England.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

"Popery in the Nineteenth Century." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 69, no. 424 (February 1851): 246–56.

"The Popish Partition of England." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 68, no. 422 (December 1850): 745–54.

"Practical Working of Trades' Unions." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 43, no. 269 (March 1838): 281–303.

"The Progress of Popery." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 44, no. 276 (October 1838): 494–507.

Radzinowicz, Leon. *A History of English Criminal Law and Its Administration from 1750.* 5 vols. London: Stevens, 1968.

Ragussis, Michael. *Figures of Conversion: "The Jewish Question" and English National Identity.* Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1995.

Ralls, Walter. "The Papal Aggression of 1850: A Study in Victorian Anti-Catholicism." *Church History* 43, no. 2 (June 1974): 242–56.

Ramm, Agatha. "The Risorgimento in Sicily: Recent Literature." *English Historical Review* 87, no. 345 (Fall 1972): 795–811.

Reed, John. "English Imperialism and the Unacknowledged Crime of *The Moonstone*." *Clio* 2, no. 3 (June 1973): 281–90.

Reed, John Shelton. *Glorious Battle: The Cultural Politics of Victorian Anglo-Catholicism.* Nashville, Tenn., and London: Vanderbilt University Press, 1996.

"The Religions of India." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 82, no. 506 (December 1857): 743–67.

Riall, Lucy. "Hero, Saint or Revolutionary? Nineteenth-Century Politics and the Cult of Garibaldi." *Modern Italy* 3, no. 2 (Winter 1998): 191–204.

Rice, Thomas Jackson. Barnaby Rudge: *An Annotated Bibliography.* New York: Garland, 1987.

———. "The End of Dickens's Apprenticeship: Variable Focus in *Barnaby Rudge*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 30 (1976): 172–84.

The Rights of Labour Defended: or, The Trial of the Glasgow Cotton Spinners, for the Alleged Crime of Conspiracy, &c. &c. to Maintain or Raise the Wages of Labour, Before the High Court of Justiciary, At Edinbugh, On the 10th and 27th November, 1837. Printed and published for the Glasgow Committee of Trades' Delegates. [Glasgow]: H. Robinson & Co., 1837.

Roberts, J. M. *The Mythology of the Secret Societies.* New York: Scribners, 1972.

Roberts, Marie Mulvey, and Hugh Ormsby-Lennon, eds. *Secret Texts: The Literature of Secret Societies.* New York: AMS Press, 1995.

Roberts, Marie Mulvey. *British Poets and Secret Societies.* London: Croom Helm, 1986.

Robison, John. *Proofs of a Conspiracy Against all the Religions and Governments of Europe, carried on in the secret meetings of the Free Masons, Illuminati and Reading Societies.* Edinburgh, 1797.

"Rome at the Close of 1867. Notes from Within the City." *The Contemporary Review* 7 (January 1868): 21–35.

Roper, Jon. *Democracy and Its Critics: Anglo-American Democratic Thought in the Nineteenth Century.* London: Unwin Hyman, 1989.

Rosenberg, Brian. "Physical Opposition in *Barnaby Rudge*." *Victorian Newsletter* 67 (Spring 1985): 21–22.

Rotberg, Robert I. *The Founder: Cecil Rhodes and the Pursuit of Power.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Rowell, Geoffrey. *The Vision Glorious: Themes and Personalities of the Catholic Revival in Anglicanism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.

"Royal Supremacy and Papal Aggression." *North British Review* 15, no. 29 (May 1851): 254–89.

Rundle, Vivienne. "'Devising New Means': *Sartor Resartus* and the Devoted Reader." *Victorian Newsletter* 82 (Fall 1992): 13–22.

Ryan, Alvin S. "The Attitude Towards the Reader in Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus*." *Victorian Newsletter* 23 (Spring 1963): 15–16.

Saltmarsh, John. Rev. of *An Introduction to Freemasonry* by Douglas Knoop and G. P. Jones. *Economic History Review* 8, no. 1 (November 1937): 102–4.

Schroeder, Natalie. "*Jack Sheppard* and *Barnaby Rudge:* Yet More 'Humbug' from a 'Jolter Head.'" *Studies in the Novel* 18, no. 1 (Spring 1986): 27–35.

Schwarz, Daniel R. "Art and Argument in Disraeli's *Sybil*." *Journal of Narrative Technique* 4 (1974): 19–31.

———. *Disraeli's Fiction.* London and New York: Macmillan and Barnes, 1979.

Seigel, Jules Paul, ed. *Thomas Carlyle: The Critical Heritage.* New York: Barnes, 1971.

"The Sepoy Rebellion." *The London Quarterly Review* 9, no. 17 (October 1857): 208–62.

Sharpe, Jenny. *Allegories of Empire: the Figure of Woman in the Colonial Text.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

"The Sicilian Game." *North British Review* 33, no. 66 (November 1860): 549–76.

Simmel, Georg. "The Secret and the Secret Society." In *The Sociology of Georg Simmel,* translated by Kurt H. Wolff, 307–76. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1950.

"The Situation of the Moment in Italy." *Cornhill Magazine* 2, no. 10 (October 1860): 487–92.

Smedley, Menella Bute. "Cavour." In *Victorian Women Poets: An Anthology,* edited by Angela Leighton and Margaret Reynolds, 267–68. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.

Smith, Sheila M. "Blue Books and Victorian Novelists." *Review of English Studies* 21 (1970): 23–40.

———. "Willenhall and Wodgate: Disraeli's Use of Blue Book Evidence." *Review of English Studies* 13 (1962): 368–84.

Stafford, David A. T. "Spies and Gentlemen: the Birth of the British Spy Novel, 1893–1914." *Victorian Studies* 24, no. 4 (Summer 1981): 489–509.

Stanley, Arthur Penrhyn. *The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold.* Eighth American Edition. Two volumes in one. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co., 1870.

"Statistics of Popery in Great Britain and the Colonies." *Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country* 19, no. 111 (March 1839): 261–77.

Steig, Michael. "*Ten-Thousand-a-Year* and the Political Content of *Barnaby Rudge.*" *Dickens Studies Newsletter* 4 (1973): 67–68.

Steinmetz, Andrew. *The Novitiate; or, A Year Among the English Jesuits: a Personal Narrative.* London: Smith Elder and Co., 1846.

[Stephens, Fitzjames.] "The License of Modern Novelists." *Edinburgh Review* 106, no. 215 (July 1857): 124–56.

Stewart. R. W. *Disraeli's Novels Reviewed, 1826–1968.* Metachuen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1975.

"The Struggle at Melazzo." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 88, no. 539 (September 1860): 337–43.

"Substance of Sir Robert Inglis's Two Speeches on the Catholic Question." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 24, no. 147 (December 1828, part 2): 811–31.

"The Supremacy of the Church of Rome not Acknowledged by the British Christians Till the Ninth Century." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 25, no. 150 (March 1829): 331–45.

Sussman, Herbert. *Victorian Masculinities: Manhood and Masculine Poetics in Early Victorian Literature and Art.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Sutherland, John. "Wilkie Collins and the Origins of the Sensation Novel." *Dickens Studies Annual: Essays on Victorian Fiction* 20 (1991): 243–58.

Swinton, Archibald. *Report of the trial of Thomas Hunter, Peter Hacket, Richard M'Neil, James Gibb, and William M'Lean, Operative Cotton-Spinners in Glasgow, Before the High Court of Justiciary, at Edinburgh, on Wednesday, January 3, 1838, and Seven Following Days, for the Crimes of Illegal Conspiracy and Murder; with an Appendix of Documents and Relative Proceedings.* Edinburgh : Thomas Clark, 1838.

Tait's Edinburgh Magazine 5 (September 1838): 611–12.

Tambling, Jeremy. *Dickens, Violence and the Modern State: Dreams of the Scaffold.* London: Macmillan; New York: St. Martin, 1995.

Taylor, Jenny Bourne. *In the Secret Theatre of Home: Wilkie Collins, Sensations Narrative and Nineteenth-Century Psychology.* London and New York: Routledge, 1988.

Taylor, Philip Meadows. *Confessions of a Thug* (1839). Edited by Patrick Brantlinger. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Tennyson, Lord Alfred. "The Defence of Lucknow." In *The Poems of Tennyson.* Edited by Christopher Ricks, Vol. 3, 36–39. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

———. "Havelock." In *The Poems of Tennyson,* edited by Christopher Ricks, Vol. 2, 598–99. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

———. "Jack Tar." In *The Poems of Tennyson,* edited by Christopher Ricks, Vol. 2, 603–4. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

———. "Riflemen Form!" *The Poems of Tennyson,* edited by Christopher Ricks, Vol. 2, 604–5. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

Tennyson, G. B. *"Sartor" Called "Resartus": The Genesis, Structure, and Style of Thomas Carlyle's First Major Work.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Thackeray, William Makepeace. *Vanity Fair: A Novel Without a Hero* (1847–48). Edited by Ron Singer. New York: Bantam, 1997.

Thomas, Ronald R. "Minding the Body Politic: The Romance of Science and the Revision of History in Victorian Detective Fiction." *Victorian Literature and Culture* 19 (1991): 233–54.

Thomis, Malcolm. I. *The Luddites: Machine-Breaking in Regency England.* New York: Ashgate, 1993 [reprint of Newton Abbot edition, 1970].

Thompson, E. P. *The Making of the English Working Class.* New York: Vintage, 1966.

"The Thugs, or Phansigars." *Foreign Quarterly Review* 21 (April 1838): 1–18.

"The Thugs; or, Secret Murderers of India." *Edinburgh Review* 64 (October 1836–January 1837): 357–95.

"Tidings from Turin." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 85, no. 523 (May 1859): 612–25.

The Times:

"The Bishop of London's Charge." 5 Nov. 1850: 5.

"The Bishops on Papal Aggression." 11 Nov. 1850: 5.

"Cardinal Wiseman." Letter. 13 Nov. 1850: 8.

"Cardinal Wiseman and Dr. Ullathorne." Letter. 5 Nov. 1850: 5.

"Dr. Cumming on the Romish Aggression." 8 Nov. 1850: 5.

Editorial. 14 Oct. 1850: 4.

Editorial. 19 Oct. 1850: 4.

Editorial. 22 Oct. 1850: 4.

Editorial. 24 Oct. 1850: 4.

Editorial. 30 Oct. 1850: 4–5.

Editorial. 4 Nov. 1850: 4.

Editorial. 5 Nov. 1850: 4.

Editorial. 6 Nov. 1850: 4.

Editorial. 7 Nov. 1850: 4.

Editorial. 16 Nov. 1850: 4.

"Great Meeting of the Clergy." 1 Nov. 1850: 5.

"Gunpowder Plot." Letter. 7 Nov. 1850: 5.

"Gunpowder Plot." Letter. 11 Nov. 1850: 5.

"The Gunpowder Plot" [sermon abstracts]. 6 Nov. 1850: 5–6.

Letter. 11 Nov. 1850: 4.

"Papal Aggression." 9 Nov. 1850: 5.

"Papal Aggression." 14 Nov. 1850: 6.

"Papal Aggression." Letter. 8 Nov. 1850: 3.

"The Popish Aggression." 15 Nov. 1850: 8.

"The Queen and the Pope." 16 Nov. 1850: 8.

"Reply of the Bishop of London." 8 Nov. 1850: 5.

"Reply of the Bishop of London to the Memorial from the Westminster Clergy." 29 Oct. 1850: 5.

"A Roman Catholic Explanation of the Papal Aggression." Letter. 16 Nov. 1850: 6.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America* (1835–1840). Edited and translated by Harvey C. Mansfield and Delba Winthrop. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Tosh, John. "The Making Of Masculinities: The Middle Class In Late Nineteenth-Century Britain." In *The Men's Share? Masculinities, Male Support and Women's Suffrage in Britain, 1890–1920,* edited by Angela V. John and Claire Eustance, 38–61. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.

———. "New Men? The Bourgeois Cult of Home." In *Victorian Values: Personalities and Perspectives in Nineteenth-Century Society,* edited by Gordon Marsden, 77–87. 2d ed. London: Longman, 1998.

Tracts for the Times. 6 Vols. London: J. G. F. & J. Rivington, 1834–41.

"Trades' Unions and Strikes." *Edinburgh Review* 57 (April–July 1838): 209–58.

"Treason Within the Church." *Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country* 18, no. 104 (August 1838): 187–95.

"Treason Within the Church." *Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country* 18, no. 108 (December 1838): 751–58.

Trela, D. J. and Roger L. Tarr, eds. *The Critical Response to Thomas Carlyle's Major Works.* Westport, Conn., and London: Greenwood, 1997.

"The Trial of the Glasgow Cotton Spinners." *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine* 5 n.s. (February 1838): 78–81.

Trilling, Lionel. *Sincerity and Authenticity.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972.

"Ultramontane Doubts." *Edinburgh Review* 93, no. 190 (April 1851): 535–78.

Urquhart, David. *The Rebellion of India.* London: D. Bryce, 1857.

Vanden Bossche, Chris R. *Carlyle and the Search for Authority.* Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1991.

———. "The Speech of God-Devils: Artist as Mason and Freemason in Carlyle's Early Works."

Thomas Carlyle 1981: Papers Given at the International Thomas Carlyle Centenary Symposium, edited by Horst W. Drescher, 71–88. Frankfurt: Verlag Peter Lang, 1983.

Vincent, David. *The Culture of Secrecy: Britain 1832–1998.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Viswanathan, Gauri. *Outside the Fold: Conversion, Modernity, and Belief.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1998.

"Viva L'Italia!" *All the Year Round* (9 July 1859): 253–57.

Waite, Arthur Edward. *A New Encyclopedia of Freemasonry.* New York: Wing Books, 1996 [reprint from University Books, 1970].

Walsh, Walter. *The Secret History of the Oxford Movement.* Popular Edition. London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1899.

Washbrook, David. "After the Mutiny: From Queen to Queen-Empress." *History Today* 47, no. 9 (September 1997): 10–15.

Waterston, Elizabeth. "Past and Present Selves: Patterns in *Sartor Resartus.*" In *Thomas Carlyle 1981: Papers Given at the International Thomas Carlyle Centenary Symposium,* edited by Horst W. Drescher, 111–24. Frankfurt: Lang, 1983.

Welsh, Alexander. *George Eliot and Blackmail.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1985.

Williams, A. Susan. *The Rich Man and the Diseased Poor in Early Victorian Literature.* London: Macmillan, 1987.

Williams, Raymond. *Culture and Society 1780–1950.* London: Chatto & Windus, 1959.

———. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society.* Revised edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Wills, Adele. "Witnesses and Truth: Juridical Narratives and Dialogism in Wilkie Collins' *The Moonstone* and *The Woman in White.*" *New Formations: A Journal of Culture/Theory/Politics* 32 (Autumn-Winter 1997): 91–98.

Wilmhurst, W. L. *The Meaning of Masonry.* New York: Gamercy, 1980 [reprint of 1922 edition].

Wiseman, Nicholas, Cardinal. *An Appeal to the Reason and Good Feeling of the English People on the Subject of the Catholic Hierarchy.* London: Thomas Richardson and Son, 1850.

Witte, William. "Carlyle's Conversion." In *The Era of Goethe: Essays Presented to James Boyd,* 179–93. Oxford: Blackwell, 1959.

Young, Robert. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race.* London: Routledge, 1995.

Index